



# TODAY'S SPEECH

*Speech Association of the Eastern States*

## *In this Issue*

DON'T SHOVE, MR. KNOWLES  
PARLIAMENTARY LAW IS BASICALLY SOUND  
*by* JOSEPH F. O'BRIEN ..... page 2

ORAL INTERPRETATION  
AND GROWTH OF PERSONALITY  
*by* EARL E. FLEISCHMAN ..... page 4

CLOSE THAT OPEN DOOR  
*by* RALPH N. SCHMIDT ..... page 8

NEEDED: SCHOOLS OF COMMUNICATION  
*by* WALTER DUNCAN ..... page 10

A REPORT ON TELEVISION SPEECH-MAKING  
*by* ROBERT HAAKENSEN ..... page 11

GHOST-WRITING: ANCIENT AND HONORABLE  
*by* WALTER J. STELKOVIS ..... page 17

HOW IS YOUR CHILD'S SPEECH?  
*by* FRANK WESTLEY MERRITT ..... page 19

HELPING PAUL TO HEAR  
*by* HARRIET M. DUNN & CHRISTINE L. McCLOSKY .... page 21

## — DEPARTMENTS —

TRENDS IN SPEECH IN THE EASTERN STATES  
*by* CARROLL C. ARNOLD ..... page 24

SIGNIFICANT RESEARCH IN THE EASTERN STATES  
*by* DAVID C. PHILLIPS ..... page 27

TODAY'S SPEECH BOOKS IN REVIEW  
*by* ARTHUR EISENSTADT ..... page 28

OUR AUTHORS ..... page 32

# Today's Speech

A Publication of the Eastern States Speech Association

Volume 2, Number 1

January, 1954

ROBERT T. OLIVER, EDITOR  
*The Pennsylvania State University  
State College, Pennsylvania*

MARVIN G. BAUER, PRESIDENT  
*Brooklyn 10, New York  
Brooklyn College*

GORDON HOSTETTLER, EXEC.-SEC.  
*Temple University  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania*

TRENDS IN SPEECH  
CARROLL C. ARNOLD  
*Cornell University  
Ithaca, New York*

SIGNIFICANT RESEARCH  
DAVID C. PHILLIPS  
*University of Connecticut  
Storrs, Connecticut*

TODAY'S SPEECH BOOKS  
ARTHUR EISENSTADT  
*Rutgers University  
Newark, New Jersey*

BUSINESS MANAGER  
HAROLD P. ZELKO  
*The Pennsylvania State University  
State College, Pennsylvania*

CIRCULATION MANAGER  
MILTON J. WIKSELL  
*Shepherd's College  
Shepherdstown, West Virginia*

ADVERTISING MANAGER  
ARTHUR EISENSTADT  
*Rutgers University  
Newark, New Jersey*

---

Subscription provided with membership in the Eastern States Speech Association; apply to Executive Secretary. Subscription to non-members, \$1.50 annually. Block subscriptions of 25 or more copies sent to one address. \$1.00 each. Advertising rates on request. Individual sponsorships - \$5.00; organizational sponsorships - \$15.00.

---

## SPONSORS

(As of December 1, 1953)

Agnes Allardyce, *Syracuse University*  
Carroll C. Arnold, *Cornell University*  
Marvin G. Bauer, *Brooklyn College*  
J. Calvin Callaghan, *Syracuse University*  
Martin T. Cobin, *West Virginia University*  
H. Barrett Davis, *Lehigh University*  
Jon Eisenson, *Queens College*  
Arthur Eisenstadt, *Newark College of  
Rutgers University*  
Jean C. Ervin, *University of Connecticut*  
Deane T. Finne, *City College of New York*  
Austin J. Freeley, *Boston University*  
Ruth R. Haun, *University of Pittsburgh*  
Mary B. Hennessey, *Waterbury Public Schools  
Waterbury, Connecticut*  
James H. Henning, *West Virginia University*  
Helen Hicks, *Hunter College*  
Gordon F. Hostettler, *Temple University*  
Robert B. Huber, *University of Vermont*  
Ray E. Keesey, *University of Delaware*  
Evelyn Konigsberg, *New York City Board of Edu.*  
Leroy Lewis, *American Institute of Banking*  
Harriett Nesbitt, *Pennsylvania State University*  
Robert P. Newman, *University of Pittsburgh*

Joseph F. O'Brien, *Pennsylvania State University*  
Mardel Ogilvie, *Queens College*  
Robert T. Oliver, *Pennsylvania State University*  
Lindsey S. Perkins, *Brooklyn College*  
David C. Phillips, *University of Connecticut*  
Brooks Quimby, *Bates College*  
Richard C. Reager, *Rutgers University*  
J. Walter Reeves, *Peddie School*  
Ota T. Reynolds, *Hunter College*  
A. M. Margaret H. Richards, *Berwick Public  
Schools, Berwick, Pa.*  
Earl H. Ryan, *City College of New York*  
Ralph N. Schmidt, *Utica College of Syracuse U.*  
Clayton H. Schug, *Pennsylvania State University*  
Nadine Shepardson, *Mt. Holyoke College*  
Solomon Simonson, *St. U. of N. Y., (Fredonia)*  
William S. Tacey, *University of Pittsburgh*  
Ruth H. Thomas, *Syracuse University*  
Lloyd W. Weldon, *West Virginia University*  
Herbert Wichelns, *Cornell University*  
Milton J. Wiksell, *Shepherd College*  
Harold Zelko, *Pennsylvania State University*  
New York Speech Association  
Pennsylvania State Speech Association  
Titan Metal Manufacturing Co., *Bellefonte, Pa.*

## What Should We Teach?

In one of our articles in this issue Walter Duncan raises the question of whether our basic college course in communication skills (normally English Composition) ought not to incorporate speaking and listening along with writing. Many will recall the study by Paul T. Rankin, published in the *Chicago Schools Journal*, June, 1930, in which he concluded (on the basis of a 1929 survey) that communicative effectiveness depends 47% on listening; 28.5% on talking; 17.3% on reading; and 7.2% on writing.

According to "The Foreman's Letter," distributed by the National Foreman's Institute, for October 26, 1953, in 1950 the Pentagon asked the Psychological Corporation to make a study of the activities of foremen, to determine what they actually do on the job. The psychologists observed 171 foremen in five plants making different products, located in five different sections of the country. After more than 500 hours of observation, they pooled their findings and discovered that the foremen spend more than 50% of their time "talking" (giving instructions, asking questions, boosting morale, etc.)

At the Pennsylvania State University (College, until last Nov.), a doctoral dissertation completed in 1949 by Miriam Elizabeth Wilt, entitled *A Study of Teacher Awareness of Listening as a Factor in Elementary Education*, sheds more light on this question. Dr. Wilt questioned 1452 public school teachers as to their judgment of the importance of the four basic communication skills in the learning process. Ratings were as follows:

	Reading	Speaking	Listening	Writing
First	897 61.8%	318 21.9%	232 16%	5 .3%
Second	272 18.7%	489 33.7%	620 42.7%	71 4.9%
Third	268 18.5%	542 37.3%	413 28.4%	229 15.8%
Fourth	15 1%	103 7.1%	187 12.9%	1147 79%

Such figures raise a number of questions. Why is not Speech required at least as widely as is English Composition? Shouldn't all high school and college students be required to take two full years, at a minimum, of instruction in Speech — instead of one semester, or none? Won't Speech teachers have more support than they may anticipate in proposing such a requirement? Is the study of listening being neglected in our Speech classes? Shouldn't we encourage more such measurement studies?

## Nobel Prize for Oratory

On October 15, 1953, in the first Nobel Prize ever to cite oratory as a reason for the award, Sir Winston Churchill was honored by the Swedish Academy with a citation which read: "For his historical and biographical presentations and for his scintillating oratory in which he has stood forth as a defender of eternal human value."

In its editorial account of the awarding of the Nobel Prize, on October 16, the *New York Times* said:

"This award says that words well chosen, uttered at the right time, bravely spoken, are the most powerful things in the world. They are powerful because they appeal to the hearts of men. They can drive men to madness, as Hitler's words did. They may inspire them to acts of utter heroism and self-sacrifice, as Churchill's did. . . .

But one's concern in the case of Winston Churchill cannot be with the artisanship or even with the artistry of the words he has used. Men as great as he have been dull at speech—but not often. The flames that light the Churchill style and the great heroic glow that warms his language are not the results of schooling or of painful imitation, but of character, ideas, determination, courage. The aristocratic Churchill, ending his career as the leader of the old Tory party, somehow managed to sense the spirit of the democratic age. After the evacuation of Dunkerque he substituted words for tanks, phrases for artillery, the throb of an impassioned English for the bayonets that still had to be forged. This language was born out of history, out of Chaucer and all who followed Chaucer, out of the great constitutional documents that are part of our heritage of freedom, too. Winston Churchill, the Conservative, believed in freedom, in the honor and integrity of the individual, in the essentials of democracy. And he spoke and wrote these beliefs in words that will be remembered as long as the record of this century stands."

In his own analysis of how his style and oratorical ability were developed, Churchill attributed it in part to the fact that he was "held back" for three years at Harrow, because of deficiency in Latin and mathematics, and was given instead hard drill in English: "Thus," he wrote, "I got into my bones the essential structure of the ordinary English sentence—which is a noble thing."



# Don't Shove, Mr. Knowles - Parliamentary Law Is Basically Sound

By Joseph F. O'Brien

(In an article entitled, "Move Over, Mr. Robert!," published in *Adult Leadership*, June, 1952, Malcolm S. Knowles criticized parliamentary law, and particularly parliamentary law as treated in *Robert's Rules of Order*, as unduly formal and more or less outdated. Mr. Knowles' article, written in informal direct discourse, was addressed to "Mr. Robert". The present article, using a similar style, and addressed to "Mr. Knowles," will attempt to draw certain important distinctions between the legitimate and less well-grounded phases of the Knowles criticism of parliamentary procedure.)

You know, Mr. Knowles, you must be a likeable gentleman—you phrase your criticism of parliamentary law as personified by "Mr. Robert" so tactfully. True, there is an element of condescension in your remarks, as though you considered "Mr. Robert" a once useful citizen now pretty well along in his dotage. But, after all, you did not request "Mr. Robert" to leave the table, you just asked him to "move over," to make room for some new ideas.

Your well intentioned, and even partly justified, remarks may, however, start a game of "musical chairs" in parliamentary procedure. This game has its points as party entertainment, but may wreak havoc if played at business meetings. In a spirit as friendly as your own, then, may I offer some emendations (there it is, see—a formal motion to amend!) to your report.

You do have a case in one important phase of your criticism, and deserve our thanks for bringing the matter to our attention: Mr. Robert and other parliamentary authorities are inclined to place too much emphasis on the *rules* for orderly discussion and too little emphasis on *other important phases* of the discussion process. The more significant matters too often omitted or understated are these: the relationship of rules to the democratic process; that principles are more important than rules; that discussion, both formal and informal, is a process in human relations as well as a procedure by rules; that procedure must be adapted to the situation; and that committee procedure is substantially different from assembly procedure.

This last item, the difference between committee and assembly procedure, is what the lugubrious committee you cite, buried in formal motions, failed to understand. A committee is a face to face group which proceeds by subject-centered, informal discussion. Its purpose is usually that of problem solution, with the solution selected by the majority as best, together with any minority report or reports (you will note a *plurality of solutions may readily emerge*), then presented to the assembly for final action.

Mr. Robert understood that committee procedure is much less formal than assembly procedure, of course. Even so, he does get off to a poor start in his explanation by prefacing it with the remark that "The rules of the assembly, as far as possible, apply to the committee. . . ."<sup>1</sup> A recent work in the field, however, leads off with the statement that "A committee session should usually be conducted according to the principles of a genuine group discussion of inquiry," and then spells out the informality of the committee as compared with the formality of the assembly, thus:<sup>2</sup>

1. The role of the presiding officer: The chairman of the committee, in contrast with the same official in the assembly, should take an active part in all discussion and need not leave the chair to participate.

2. *The development of motions*: In committee, motions usually develop from suggestions which undergo substantial modification during discussion, in contrast with the assembly, where motions usually precede discussion.

3. *The freedom of discussion permitted*: No limitation upon debate whatsoever applies in the committee except by assembly action, in contrast with the assembly, where both general and specific limitations on debate may be enforced.

4. *The general informality of procedure permissible*: There is a relaxation of such assembly requirements as that the chair must rise to put questions, members must rise to speak, and motions must be seconded.

How about it, Mr. Knowles, is this procedure informal enough for a committee?

But, you say, the problem-solving process



should show a definite pattern, follow certain definite steps. Right you are, Mr. Knowles, but recent writers in parliamentary procedure are also well aware of this need. Let's compare the problem-solving procedure you recommended with the one submitted in the same recent work on parliamentary law just cited:

The Knowles problem-solution sequences:<sup>3</sup>

1. Defining the problem
2. Discovering the factors and forces underlying the problem
3. Getting all necessary information about the problem and possible solutions
4. Testing these solutions against facts and experience
5. Making a decision, planning action
6. Evaluating results

The problem-solution sequence from a recent work on parliamentary procedure:<sup>4</sup>

- I. What is the nature of the problem?
  - A. What are the facts which show there is a problem?
  - B. Where, how frequently, and under what conditions do these facts occur?
  - C. What are the underlying causes of the facts which indicate a problem?
- II. What is the best solution of the problem, taking into consideration:
  - A. The need to be met as above defined.
  - B. The possible solutions available.
  - C. The practicality of the solutions according to:
    1. The experience of other organizations or committees with the solutions.
    2. The testimony of experts on the solutions.
    3. The freedom of the solutions from disadvantages.

Now, Mr. Knowles, honest and amiable gentleman that you are, isn't the sequence from the work in parliamentary procedure *almost* as useful as the one you suggest?

About some of the other criticisms and observations you made concerning rules of order, Mr. Knowles, we don't feel quite so friendly. In fact, you and I, were we to discuss these comments in a sizeable assembly, might well need to have two good, old, formal motions in parliamentary procedure, *to limit debate*, and *to close debate*, applied to our discussion. One of these touchy matters is where you go so far as to say "The fact is some hardy souls have broken away from the chains (shame, Mr. Knowles, you make us par-

liamentarians sound like a chain gang!) of parliamentary law and experimented with ways to get large assemblies—hundreds of people—working fact-to-face."

Now, then, Mr. Knowles, you look here, because it is in just this kind of situation, an assembly of several hundred, where the rules of Mr. Robert and his successors are almost essential. In fact, if the assembly is actually engaged in transacting business, such as appropriating money, electing officers, or determining policy, *and not just indulging in a conversational interchange for the purpose of mutual education*,<sup>5</sup> then nine times out of ten you simply can't get along without rules of order, draw them from what source you will.

Not only this, Mr. Knowles, but if we take your remark about face-to-face discussion for hundreds of people literally, it just can't be done. I have far too high an opinion of you to allege even mild dissembling on your part. But let's look at the situation literally, assuming an assembly of 500 persons. Now, let's assume a seating space of two-and-a-half feet per person—to assume less would mean automaton-like immobility—and see what we get in the way of dimensions. An ordinary standard conference table is five feet by three feet in size. A table which would seat five hundred persons, allowing two-and-a-half feet each, would be approximately four hundred feet by two hundred and twenty-five feet in size. This is *one hundred feet longer than a football field, and sixty-five feet more in width*. The discussion members would be face-to-face, yes, in a way. With the aid of a stentorian sound system (the same kind they use at football games) and \$25,000 worth of binoculars (just modest ones, at, say, \$50.00 a pair) the members *could* hear one another, and *could* see one another. But *is this anything like a true face-to-face situation*, Mr. Knowles? We believe you'll agree that it isn't, though it might be fun to try it, just as a lark.

What you have in mind, then, must be some device like "Discussion 66,"<sup>6</sup> where members are broken up into groups of six each, and then report to the entire assembly. This is all right for the mutual exchange of ideas. Mr. Knowles; but would even you recommend it for the actual transaction of business?

And, finally, Mr. Knowles, just what, exactly, do you mean when you say that your "main gripe" is Mr. Robert's "insistence on voting on everything. . . deciding an issue by power. . . although under the rules of the game the losers agree to

go along with the will of the majority, they don't feel actually committed to the decision—we're convinced that no solution is a final solution unless everybody concerned agrees to it."

Again, if we take literally what you say, we must conclude that the U. S. Congress, for the past 150 years, has reached no solution that is a final solution on the issues confronting it. Frankly, though, we doubt that you would carry your conclusion that far.

But about this business of voting in general. Parliamentarians do not advise that a vote be taken on anything and everything. In fact, they advise the contrary, that on purely procedural matters the decision be taken by "general consent."<sup>7</sup> But on important substantive issues, concerned with basic policy, the election and conduct of officers, and the rights and responsibilities of members, really, Mr. Knowles, can you afford to rely upon the camouflage of consensus? If the members *are* all in favor of the proposal, let them stand up and be counted; or, if opinion is divided, still let them stand up and be counted, so that the legal requirement of a majority may be met. We are here concerned, of course, with the actual transaction of business, not with the sheer educa-

tional exchange of opinion.

Now, as to this business of whether a defeated minority will go along with the decision of the majority. Really, Mr. Knowles, we're a bit surprised at you. Wasn't Bob Taft's heart in his support of the Eisenhower administration? How do the American people act after each election? Why, you know the answer as well as we do. We all get behind the administration (except for a few professional politicians) and push for the best interests of the community, state, or nation. That's the American way.

No, Mr. Knowles, don't shove. Parliamentary law as personified by Mr. Robert may need to relax a bit, but it's still certainly badly needed at the table.

- 1 Henry M. Robert, *Rules of Order Revised*, (Chicago, 1951), p. 212.
- 2 Joseph F. O'Brien, *Parliamentary Law for the Layman*, (New York, 1952), p. 90.
- 3 Malcolm S. Knowles, "Move Over, Mr. Robert!", *Adult Leadership*, Volume 1 (June, 1952), p. 2.
- 4 O'Brien, *op. cit.*, pp. 91-92.
- 5 This objective—mutual education through conversational interchange—is praiseworthy enough. It's only that one shouldn't confuse it with the transaction of business.
- 6 J. Donald Phillips, "Report on Discussion 66", *Adult Education Journal*, Vol. 7 (October, 1948), pp. 181-182. Also in H. L. Ewbank and J. J. Auer, *Discussion and Debate* (New York, 1951), pp. 301-302.
- 7 O'Brien, *op. cit.*, pp. 28-29, 109-110; Robert, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-26, 32, 90, 106, 202-204, 241; Alice M. Sturgis, *Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure*, (New York, 1950), pp. 68-69, 245.

## Oral Interpretation and Growth of Personality

Earl E. Fleischman

Teachers of Oral Interpretation may differ in their objectives and emphasis, but of one thing we are sure: in the classroom the student is the center of the learning enterprise. It is not subject matter with which the real teacher of Speech is primarily concerned; it is rather the student's response to subject matter. Important as *content* is—the substance of idea, attitude, and feeling in the communicative interaction of one mind on another—the enlightened Speech teacher approaches his task with a concern that he regards as even more important, namely, the student's ability to take hold of subject matter with his mind and imagination and deal with it purposefully and intelligently. Likewise with respect to the forms and functions of language and the techniques of effective oral communication, such a teacher will look upon them as tools, ready at hand, useful, indispensable, but means only, subordinate to the main purpose of stimulating, awakening, extending the student's powers to

search out significant relationships, explore with intelligent, creative human motivations the fundamental areas of human interest and experience, and to evaluate with discriminative judgment, clear perception, and penetrative insight.

This is plainly the business of Interpretative Speech. Fundamentally, the teacher of Oral Interpretation presides over and directs a dynamic experience of total response within the scope of the student's steadily enlarging capacity for self-realization and social growth toward maturity as a person. The student's potentialities as a human being become the supreme motivation; the teacher works creatively to transform him from an unknowing, unthinking, unobserving, insensitive creature with little of the power, charm, effectiveness, or social worth of a mature personality into one who measures up to these criteria of what a human being can and should be.

Since such teaching deals with intangibles it is virtually impossible to describe it in concrete

terms without seeming to shift the emphasis to *content*, on the one hand, or to techniques and communicative skills, on the other. But keeping in mind the basic definition of Speech as a dynamic process of total response within the individual operative in the medium of oral language, then Oral Interpretation, too, becomes a means for providing the student with a progression of opportunities for such responses and adjustments. Selected literary works are the materials; they serve as a kind of anvil upon which these responses and adjustments are hammered into shape to promote the maturing personality of the student. They are used to challenge his unfolding powers, to stimulate his senses, his attention, his memory, his curiosity not only to *know* but also to understand, his desire to come fully alive in his responsiveness to life-serving emotions; to search out the truths in human life and the value in human attitudes, to have light thrown on his own doubts and perplexities, to make his beliefs and his faith secure.

Literature, various works of literary art, provides the contact with concrete life situations and the poet's human response to them is caught up into a creative web of words. The student is aided in his efforts to make his response to *living* language more complete and meaningful. Knowledge *about* the selected literary works is secondary to appreciative insight into their human life content, the elements and qualities of human perception and emotional experience of which they are compounded. The aim is to install the form and content of the experience as *experience* in the pattern of the student's responses as he prepares himself for its oral interpretation. A reciprocal functioning of his interpretative powers is thus engaged. He must respond fully before he can hope to gain command of the complex of meaning and give it the requisite articulate form in his own spoken words as he tries to share it with others. Conversely, in his striving to make the language of the poem show forth what he is experiencing in his inner impulses, his sentient grasp of *what it means* tends to become clarified, his sense impressions more sharply etched in his consciousness, the range of his *comprehension* widened to a greater inclusiveness.

A part of this meaning complex is to be found in explicit statement, a part in the interaction of contexts, the cumulative reinforcement of suggestion, association, and emotional identification, and a part in the dynamics of inner impulse exerting its pressure on the tonal elements of speech, on

intonation, melodic cadence, and rhythm. To be sure, there is always the base in concrete fact, the logical structure of its ideational content, the setting, the circumstances of the human situation presented, the sequence of its unfolding. He must come into possession of all such pertinent information given within the poem to indicate the explicit intention of the verbal references, the crucial differentiations and distinctions that settle the experience into some frame of bounded logical orientation in his mind.

However, that is but the beginning of the life process involved in creating the total pattern of responses which constitute the experience itself. This basic framework of reference serves the interpreter in much the same way that the surveyor makes use of recognizable landmarks to give him his bearings and establish the boundaries of a certain terrain. Having determined the *kind*, or *nature*, of the "Speech response experience" confronting him, an intellectual procedure so far, the student goes on from there to *traverse* the experience itself in dynamic motion forward until the total experience is fulfilled in his own responding. This creative evocation makes of Interpretation something vastly more than a mere verbal exercise. It belongs to the higher levels of functioning of the human mind and draws on mental powers the full import of which educationally and socially are yet but imperfectly understood.

The teacher of Oral Interpretation, functioning as he does at the very center of this vital educative process, has it within his power to make an invaluable social contribution. There is no longer any doubt that the most urgent problem of contemporary life is essentially a spiritual one, the need of the individual for clearly perceived and warmly affirmed values that seem worthy of attainment and sufficient reason for his striving, his devotion, his deprivation of more immediate, self-centered advantages and satisfactions.

If the democratic way of life—the free association of individuals interacting one on the other—is to survive and prosper, it must be peopled with ever increasing numbers of individuals who are intellectually, emotionally, and morally mature. If coercion is to be repudiated in favor of leaving the individual free to make up his own mind and choose the pattern of behavior that to him seems best, we must be ever deeply concerned over the ability of an individual to rely on himself and to function effectively in such a society.

Educators are beginning to have some rather clearly defined notions as to what indicates such



maturity. Professor H. A. Overstreet in his book, *The Mature Mind*, for example, says that the mature person can be recognized by his possession of five basic characteristics: (1) a fund of accurate and pertinent knowledge as a foundation for his practical judgments and actions, (2) a sense of responsibility for himself and in regard to the well-being of others, (3) an articulate command of language so that he may communicate what he thinks and feels to be of value in his experience, (4) a sex function marked by natural, honest, spontaneous love impulses undistorted by prudish attitudes or blighted inhibitions yet conditioned by intelligent human considerations, and (5) a philosophy that embraces a world vision of human needs and potentialities springing from deeply held convictions about the ends of human life and the possibilities of human greatness.

When we measure our students, or *ourselves* for that matter, by such criteria we see at once the magnitude of the human problem with which it is given us to cope. The immature responses of our students give us abundant evidence of these lacks in their personalities. Sometimes we are privately amused by them, sometimes annoyed. Sometimes we are filled with vague misgivings concerning the particular student's future. And now and again we feel an overwhelming consternation that makes us ponder the failures of education and the ultimate consequences to a free society of continuing educative indifference to what is happening, or *not* happening in respect to these dynamic emotional response patterns in human behavior.

The sobering fact is that these immaturities are by no means confined to inexperienced, callow college youth. Many a so-called "intellectual" who is conversant with a great deal of factual knowledge is seemingly unaware of the immaturities that characterize his emotional behavior. He may know *about* things; he may know *the facts of life*; yet he may have very little real understanding of the things that matter, have little vital contact with the deep sources, that promote growth in the human personality and which, extending beyond the individual, have far-reaching social significance. In this day of over-emphasis on the supremacy of scientific knowledge we are confronted more and more with problems arising from the rigidity and limited capacity of the literal mind—its blindness, its insensitivity, its downright stupidity. If we need a warning concerning the ultimate consequences of such one-sided *education* in this fateful atomic age that

is upon us, we have it in the crude, barbarous attempts of Soviet-trained "brain-washers" to apply the Pavlov techniques for conditioning responses to victimize human beings.

There is an ironic inadequacy in the over-verbalized intellectualism that is being fostered by certain contemporary emphases in higher education. The separation of objective factual knowledge from a vivid consciousness of the human needs and values it should be made to serve is tending to have the effect of driving a wedge between what a person *knows* and the vital contact with the realities which enable him to find the ways in which this knowledge will be most useful to him. Nowhere is this distinction between facts as *facts* and the kind of *interpretation* needed for constructive human ends more strikingly illustrated than in the matter of the Kinsey reports on sexual behavior in human beings.

The criterion of "common sense", which we have been accustomed to invoke as a measure of practical intelligence and prudent judgment, has failed again and again to solve the individual's personality problems. He finds himself ever between the horns of the dilemma posed by Shakespeare in the famous lines of Portia, "If to do were as easy as to know what were good to do. . . ." There is abundant personal testimony of this schism that tends to exist between what a person gives assent to with his mind and the enabling emotions and motivations that are sufficiently strong to shape his attitudes and his actions. Here we encounter the basic moral problem of the free individual in the free society. This inner breakdown of dynamic integration which should link rational judgment with reinforcing emotional responses accounts for much of the so-called insincerities and hypocrisies of "lip-service" beliefs and the numerous inconsistencies to be observed between what a man *thinks* and what he *does*.

We know that "character", a word no longer in good standing among some of these very "intellectuals" because it is "too subjective", implies certain describable attitudes. We commonly associate with the word human sympathy and sensitive consideration for the rights and feelings of others, absence of preoccupation with self and sentimental desires for sympathy and approval, freedom from unrealistic wish-thinking and evasive, "buck-passing" rationalizations, a warm receptiveness to the belief in human worth and human potentialities, the capacity to recognize, respond to, and enjoy *the good things of life* without losing emotional balance, the power to meet difficulties,

frustration, and adverse turns of circumstances with calm resolution, resourcefulness, integrity, patience, and courage.

These traits are not "born"; they are *made* by a dynamic process of conditioning. They are not built into the human response mechanism in a day or by administering doses of mere knowledge. The dynamic functioning which serves to check an adolescent's impulse to throw the snowball that he holds ready in his hand at some vulnerable human object is not in any fundamental way different from the considerations operative in a mature man's decision not to release an atomic bomb.

The Speech teacher, and particularly the teacher of Oral Interpretation, is working directly with this dynamic conditioning process. The aim is to produce not an individual trained in certain specialized technical skills, nor a paragon of sophisticated knowledge, but an all-around person, an integrated individual who has provided the means of fulfilling himself as a mature personality.

Sidney Hook, the distinguished professor of philosophy of New York University, from his background of practical teaching contacts with students has observed that the chief service the college teacher can render the student is to prepare him for self-education, a life-long process. There are always books, plays, motion pictures, people, life itself, to learn from. The indispensable thing, the unique contribution, is not to teach him *what* to think, or even *how* to think, but to get him thinking with all the potential powers of his mind in all the major fields of human interest. What the student does need is to be provided with tools, the objectives, the incentives, the attitudes. He needs a sentient awareness of the world he lives in and the elements in his own nature that reflect the cosmos. He needs to know from his own experiencing what it is like to be fully alive and to live fully, to respond to life—and to life in literary art—with laughter, joy, warm affection, deep sympathy, keen admiration, and the exaltation that comes with real appreciation of the human values of trust, devotion, loyalty, gratitude, and the vision of human nobility. Most of all he needs to be assured of his own power to discover and organize in his mind the meaning of the complex world of nature and of man with which he is confronted, to learn how to note, relate, subordinate, evaluate, hold in memory for subsequent reference.

Thus the creative process of oral interpretation

begins with the concept of a poem as life incarnated by the poet in a dynamic form of speech. To give that experience its essential and appropriate form in the chosen language of the poem is the whole aim of the reader. The poetic experience unfolds in a dynamic progression within its artistic frame in accordance with its own inner laws; it begins, develops, moves with certainty forward to its predetermined end. The student follows in his own responses as best he can what he perceives to be the dynamic form of the imagined experience with the hope that his oral interpretation will come near to a realization of the life forces imbedded in the language. The object of his study is to find the *key* to the experience and let the words of the poem speak to him in their own voice. He in turn seeks to transmit the whole complexion content of their meaning in his own speech responses without loss, distortion, or interposition of arbitrary and willful personal colorings.

The teacher, in the background, seeks to help him find the pertinent linkages with life that bear on the complex of meaning that is to be drawn into an integrated unity. According to Overstreet, these *linkages* are the indispensable means by which a person grows toward his intellectual, emotional, and moral maturity as a human being and without which spiritual growth within a person ceases, his potential powers stagnate, and eventually atrophy.

It is not to be supposed that all poems extend the mind to its limits of awareness or involve the play of the more complex and profound impulses of the human soul. Fortunately, the student may be confronted with varying degrees of difficulty fitted to his rate of development and his readiness. Those interpretative *projects* which are more complex in verbal organization and tonal structure, in the delicate and elusive counterpoint of image and symbol, that call for a more knowing and sensitive responsiveness to the less tangible realities, may be reserved for his maturing interpretative powers.

The wise teacher will recognize that a relatively simple poem, which to him is so familiar and commonplace as to have lost its power to interest and enthral, may be for the novice a fresh, challenging, and utterly transforming creative experience. Refraining from imposing any arbitrary canons of taste or intruding his superior critical judgment, he will direct his efforts to providing the student with adequate tools, seeing to it that they are sharpened to a cutting edge, and to removing

the psychic barriers he encounters in the student which obstruct a full and free response. The tools needed are chiefly those which have to do with the meanings of words and the functioning of language to represent and evoke meanings. But attention must also be paid to keenness of eye and ear and the dynamic sense of muscular tension and release that gives him an insight into the dynamic nature of speech movement.

The barriers that must be broken through may vary from lack of knowledge and dullness of imagination to psychic complexes involving emotional repressions and self-conscious inhibitions that have their sources deep within the personality and lead back to environmental factors in childhood. The breaking down of such psychic barriers is a difficult and fearful business and the brash teacher must ever be reminded of the soul-shattering dislocations that can result from too arrogant, too direct, or too abrupt an attack on the problem.

Nevertheless, it is inevitable that where there is growth there are bound to be some evidences of *growing pains*. The swift and sudden penetration of new ideas and a more sophisticated view of human emotions and experiences can be strangely disturbing and upsetting to one who is confront-

ing such realities for the first time. It calls for profound readjustments, a realignment of notions of what is true and what is important in human morals and values.

Again the teacher should remain unobtrusively in the background, ever sympathetic and kindly, ready to help, never an arbiter of truth or morals for anyone else. The realities revealed by literature should be left to speak for themselves whatever of truth or significance they possess. This is the essence of free thought in a free society. The student should feel completely free to make up his own mind, to make his own responses at whatever stage of maturity he has attained.

The teacher's function is to encourage the habits of reflection, to turn the mind toward remembered experience in order to extract from it the significant meanings that may lie in it. He inducts the student into a way of living with his mind and his emotions. Time spent with the poets who have given us our most vital contacts with the riches of human experience is in itself a significant span of living which can leave a lasting impression on the individual and ever afterward condition and shape his responses, his attitudes, his values.

## Close That Open Door

By Ralph N. Schmidt

Yes, *close* that "open door"—if you want to harvest the benefits for which you originally opened it!

Why do top business executives, private professional practitioners, as well as educational administrators wholeheartedly endorse the policy of having the doors to their offices "always open" to anyone who wants to see them? The answer is obvious, in order that morale may be established and rapport maintained with their employees, clientele, teachers and students.

In education, especially, this is a worthwhile and commendable aim. I applaud the stand of the new Dean of Women at the college from which I hold the baccalaureate degree, as reported in its alumni bulletin:

"The new dean advocates an 'open door policy,' since she believes that one of the important duties of a dean is to listen to student problems. . . and to

offer the helpful, impartial advice of an interested outsider. 'An important need of the college student is to have someone he feels he can talk to and go to with her [sic] problems,' she says, 'I am available to the students, men and women, for any reason at any time.' "

I applaud the stand and I hope that she will *close that door* when a college student who needs "someone he can go to and talk with" enters.

Unreasoning adherence to the "open door" is, I believe, one of the reasons (if not **THE** reason) when educational and personal counselling fail, when teachers do NOT come in and talk over their problems, when morale and rapport break down. Why? Because no one wants his private problem paraded before secretaries, overheard by those "waiting outside" (but within hearing range), interrupted by heads poked in the door with the inane, "Mind if I interrupt, this won't



take more than a minute. . . ." People are still persons and react as such.

When people pass through that "open door," the resulting oral communication is conversation, interviewing (a specialized form of conversation), or counselling (a specialized form of interviewing). In the latter two instances, privacy is an important requisite for success. This is amply supported in the literature. Bingham and Moore, for example, indicate:

When more than two person are present at an interview, there are more relationships to observe and fine adjustments to make between personalities. Self-consciousness is heightened. The resulting caution and inhibitions may seriously limit frankness of statement. Although not imperative, privacy is usually desirable.<sup>1</sup>

Frances S. Drake is more specific:

The interview should be limited to the two participants and should be marked by a high degree of freedom from distractions and interruptions. Under these conditions, both parties need respond to fewer stimuli; they can concentrate more effectively on the business at hand. The interviewee is less self-conscious and reluctant to speak of personal matters where there is complete privacy. Telephone calls, miscellaneous interruptions, and the presence of other applicants tend to inhibit free expression on his part, if not actually to jeopardize any chance of gaining his confidence.<sup>2</sup>

Annette Garrett endorses this position:

The physical setting of the interview may determine its entire potentiality. Some degree of privacy and a comfortable relaxed atmosphere are important. The interviewee . . . has a right to feel that whether the interview lasts five minutes or an hour, he has, for that time, the undivided attention of the interviewer. Interruptions, telephone calls, and so

on, should be reduced to a minimum. . . .<sup>3</sup>

Kinsey, Pomerey and Martin are positive:

Places where interviews are held should be reasonably soundproof, and there should be no unexpected interruptions from other persons entering the room. From the very set-up of the interview, the subject must be reassured of confidence.<sup>4</sup>

The truth and validity of the positions taken by these authors will not, I think, be questioned. The conclusion to be drawn is clear: we must revise and restate our policy.

May I suggest the following restatement? "When my door is open, I am always available to my students and my teachers. When my door is *not* open, it soon will be. When my door is closed, it is your guarantee that, just as the confidences of the person now consulting with me will not be disclosed, so will your confidences be safeguarded."

To avoid criticism that this is a reversion to the days when the informer was encouraged and protected, why not put a heavy soundproof plate glass window in the door to our offices? Let us continue to face that door (as we do now) and let the one seeking our advice face us—free from the distraction of faces at the window in the door. Better yet, let us (when possible) arrange to have an "inner room" opening off from our office into which we can take our visitors when it becomes apparent that their purpose is confidential. And let us *always* refuse to be interrupted by that insistent and clamorous client—the telephone. The secretary can always take the number for us to "call back" when we are free.

If you want people to pass through your "open door" and really let you know "what's on their minds and hearts," *close* that door when privacy is essential!

1 Bingham, Walter Van Dyke and Moore, Bruce Victor, *How to Interview*, Harper & Brothers, 1941, p. 30.

2 Drake, Frances S., *Manual of Employment Interviewing, Research Report Number Nine*, American Management Association, New York, 1946, pp. 30-31.

3 Garrett, Annette, *Interviewing, Its Principles and Methods*, Family Service Association of America, New York, 1942, p. 55.

4 Kinsey, Alfred C., Pomeroy, Wardell B., Martin, Clyde E., *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, W. B. Saunders Company, Philadelphia, 1948, p. 47.

# Needed: Schools of Communication

By Walter Duncan

"When the Columbia Broadcasting Company conducted a survey of communicative habits, it found that 9 percent of our waking time is spent in writing, 16 percent in reading, 30 percent in speaking, and 45 percent in listening," declare Robert T. Oliver and Rupert L. Cortright in *New Training for Effective Speech*. "Because of ineffectiveness in our use of these processes," they continue, "psychologists are wont to agree that when communication is attempted misunderstanding is the rule and understanding is but an occasional happy accident."

These authors are supported by the distinguished philosopher, H. A. Overstreet. In his best seller, *The Mature Mind*, he states that "In no area of our maturing. . . is arrested development more common than in the area of communication."

Carrying this trend of thought further, S. I. Hayakawa, the semanticist, in *Language in Action* says: ". . . we live in an environment shaped and partially created by hitherto unparalleled semantic influences: commercialized newspapers, commercialized radio programs, 'public relations counsel', and the propaganda techniques of nationalistic madmen. Citizens of a modern society need to be scientifically aware of the mechanism of interpretation if they are to guard against being driven mad by the welter of words with which they are faced." Hayakawa adds: "It would seem that the almost miraculous efficiency achieved by modern instruments of communication should enable nations to understand each other better and co-operate more fully. But, as we know too well, the opposite has been the case; the better the communications, the bloodier the quarrels." Like Hayakawa, many semanticists feel that the very future of mankind may depend upon a rectification of word-habits.

And semanticists are not alone in their concern about ineffective communications in our society. Most serious-minded people, in fact, have given a great deal of thought to this problem. So that today, as never before, we realize the need for fully understanding the act and the art of communication: when is it successful, what makes it go wrong, how do ethics, emotions, and logic affect this act, etc.

Yet how have we tried to solve our problem in communication?

Our English departments have tackled some aspects of some of these problems. So have our Speech, philosophy, psychology, and other departments.

Yet, there has been little cooperation among our academicians. In many cases the English teachers, the Speech instructors, the logicians, the psychologists, and the semanticists have hurled attacks at each other and areas of study other than their own.

For instance, the semanticist, Alfred Korzybski, in *Science and Sanity*, says: " 'Philosophers,' 'psychologists,' 'logicians,' 'mathematicians,' etc., are somehow unable to comprehend that their work is the product of the working of their own nervous systems. For most of them it is only detached verbalism such as we often find in hospitals for 'mentally' ill." And then further on he writes: "It is pathetic, if not tragic, that society should invest millions of dollars to support such specialists who train future generations in maladjustment just because they disregard the unavoidable neuro-linguistic and neuro-semantic effects of their teachings on the lives of their pupils."

Speech teachers often criticize English instructors for being concerned with stylistic details to such an extent that their pupils never learn how to analyze a subject, organize their thoughts on it, and find sufficient materials to write a clear, vivid, logically sound paper.

And English teachers often complain that Speech instructors are only concerned with "pear-shaped" tones and "proper" gestures.

Almost any semanticist, logician, Speech or English instructor will acknowledge his own shortcomings. This has led him to do research and encourage others to do the same. Frequently, however, the thinking and research is done by a specialist who knows little about other fields and who cares only about applying what he finds out within his narrow field of specialization. Certainly little has been done to coordinate thinking and research in the broad field of communications.

As said above, however, most of us have become communications conscious, and this has led to some ironic activities. Authors and publishers are using the word *communication* in some form in the titles of books that several years ago would have been called an English or Speech text. One

well-known professor of Speech publicly admitted that he used this word throughout his book on public speaking to appease the communications-interested publishers, teachers, and general public. A college dean once complained that he didn't like "public speaking" as the title for a course in the University catalogue. Admittedly "oral communication" might be a better title, but the Dean's concern must be more fundamental than merely changing the name of the course. His concern is obviously symptomatic of the general frustration among those who administer, supervise, or teach courses in communication skills.

What we need to do is rather obvious. The Speech experts, the English composition teachers, the psychologists, the semanticists, and the logicians need to sit down together and do some serious thinking, studying, talking and problem solving.

This might lead to the creation of a division or school of communication for the purpose of integrating the work in various departments, a school wherein a philosophy of communication could be formulated, a school wherein various courses in communicative activities could be adequately evaluated, a school where communications courses could be intelligently administered and taught, a school wherein techniques and devices for teaching courses could be developed and tested, and above all a school that could instigate and coordinate research.

Something like this must be done to integrate the now often diverse activities of our English composition teachers, Speech instructors, general semanticists, and other academicians who teach or direct activities in communications—but who often don't know what they should teach or how or to whom.

## A Report On Television Speech Making

By Robert Haakenson

Watching my television screen with a professional as well as a layman's eye during the past several years, I have been struck with various instances in which the presumably top-notch actors have been put to shame by unskilled guests on the programs who seized the spotlight simply by being unpretentiously themselves. On one occasion, a sponsor appeared for a few moments to join in an anniversary celebration — and his few natural words of appreciation stood out in refreshing contrast to the "jazzed up" artificial enthusiasm of the professionals. On another program, in which a zoo keeper is interviewed by a commercial announcer, the candid, knowledgeable comments of the man who knows his subject appeal far more than the "bright" remarks of the interrogator.

Whether we are to be speakers, critics or both, it seems worth our while to inquire into television speechmaking—to look at some of the highlights, and to consider possible principles of effectiveness that may have evolved from the reactions of such critics as Jack Gould of *The New York Times*, John Crosby, syndicated columnist of *The New York Herald-Tribune*, Philip Hamburger of *The New Yorker Magazine*, and others.

### SIX YEARS OF TELEVISED SPEECHES

Certain men stand as phenomena in this new field of television speechmaking. The first is

Thomas E. Dewey, whose substantial victory margin in his reelection to the Governorship of New York in 1950 was attributed largely to his effectiveness in an 18-hour "telethon" the day before the election. For at least part of every hour for eighteen consecutive hours, he appeared before the television cameras—most of the time providing on-the-spot answers to questions that were thrown at him.

Estes Kefauver was a moderately well-known Senator from Tennessee when he became chairman of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee. Televising of the Committee's hearings captivated the nation in the early months of 1951. One short year later Kefauver became a leading contender for the Democratic presidential nomination, winning more state primaries than any other Democratic aspirant. Going into the convention, according to the Gallup poll, he was a favorite of 45% of his party against 18% for the next contender.

Rudolph Halley, counsel for the Crime Committee, was described as an "unknown" before the televising of the hearings. In the Fall of the same year he was elected to the Presidency of the New York City Council against strong opposition from the two major parties. "Television can claim most of the credit," wrote John Crosby. Though Halley failed in his November, 1953, bid to be-



come Mayor of New York, he has achieved great prominence since early 1951.

A fourth man who may be regarded as a phenomenon in television speechmaking invited professional suicide in two ways. Bishop Fulton Sheen agreed, first, to make his debut on television scheduled opposite Milton Berle on NBC and Frank Sinatra on CBS. Secondly, it was made known that he would try to sustain an entire half-hour program simply with talk. *Time* magazine in April, 1952, reported his spectacular success: "DuMont was overwhelmed by the mail response (8,000 letters a week). The program, now carried by 17 stations, has a Trendex popularity rating of 13.7 (more than 2,000,000 TV viewers) unequaled by any other 'inspirational' or intellectual show." It was suggested that a ten point drop in Milton Berle's popularity rating might be attributable to Bishop Sheen. A spokesman for the Archdiocese of New York, producer of the program, stated that four times as many requests for tickets for the telecast were received than could be filled.

This initial impact was merely a prelude to Bishop Sheen's subsequent *tour de force*. During the 1952-53 broadcast season and again this season, the program has a commercial sponsor (Admiral appliances), a rare achievement for a "public service" program. The program is carried over many additional stations in different cities. Estimates of the size of his weekly audience range from eight million to fifteen million and even more.

#### OTHERS NOT TO BE OVERLOOKED

It is a little unfair to single out four men and describe them as the phenomena of television speaking. A number of others deserve consideration. The late Senator Charles Tobey, for example, became a national symbol during the Crime Committee hearings. The appearance of General Douglas MacArthur before a joint session of Congress in April, 1951, after his recall from his Pacific commands, assembled perhaps the largest television audience of that year, and immortalized the phrase, "Old soldiers never die." Rare was the Sunday afternoon when the late Senator Robert Taft did not appear on one or another of the Sunday afternoon television discussion programs.

During a speech being televised from St. Louis in November, 1950, someone in the audience cried out to the speaker, "Give 'em hell, Harry." This cry was to become standard procedure at President Truman's political talks during the next two years, especially in the campaign speeches of

1952. In his televised speeches, he achieved a broad range between eloquence and unimpressiveness. Perhaps the outstanding ones were 1) his acceptance of the Democratic nomination in Philadelphia in 1948 (to a limited television audience), 2) the speech with which he hurriedly went on the air to explain the recall of General MacArthur, 3) his Jefferson-Jackson Day speech in 1952, which he concluded abruptly with a surprise announcement that he would not be a candidate for renomination in 1952, 4) his closing campaign speech on the evening before the 1952 election, 5) his "valedictory," presented shortly before President Eisenhower's inauguration in January, 1953, and 6) his speech on the Harry Dexter White case, November 16, 1953.

Some political aspirants, impressed with the power of television, went "all out" trying to apply it. In his bid for the Republican nomination in early 1952, Harold Stassen employed the techniques of commercial television, presenting a series of semidramatized programs. Michael DiSalle and Leonard Schmidt, Senatorial candidates in Ohio and Wisconsin, respectively, each employed the "telethon" technique pioneered by Governor Dewey.

Recalling the 1952 nominating conventions one might think of Herbert Hoover "prompting" the "teleprompter," or of Everett Dirksen, Paul Douglas, keynoters Douglas MacArthur or Governor Devers, or even of Judge Romany (who wanted the Puerto Rican delegation polled). One of the undeniably memorable speeches was that of Alben Barkley, after he was summarily dropped as a candidate for being "too old".

In the flood of campaign speaking, one speech was distinctly different. Republican vice-presidential candidate Richard Nixon, charged with unethical financial procedures, went before a nationwide television and radio audience, pleaded for and got a flood of telegrams and mail, and immortalized the family's dog "Checkers" and the "Republican cloth coat" of his wife Pat, who was on the platform with him.

The Democratic presidential candidate in 1952, Adlai Stevenson, had a limited national prominence when he accepted the nomination in July. By November he had become prominent enough to gain twenty-seven million votes, a number topped by only two other candidates: his opponent Dwight Eisenhower (who received an unprecedented thirty-three million votes), and Franklin Roosevelt as Democratic victor in 1936. Although Stevenson was criticized for "speaking over the

heads of the people," his speaking often was lavishly praised. Published collections of his speeches have been best-sellers.

General Eisenhower had made history as a television speaker long before he became a presidential candidate. While he was president of Columbia University, President Truman asked him to make a tour inspecting the defenses of Western European nations. Returning in February, 1951, he went on television to report his findings and delivered what has been called, "the first hand-painted speech in history." Speaking from the Pentagon, he decided to free himself from handling a manuscript, enabling him to create the impression of speaking directly to the people, by reading from large cards which were held between and just beyond the television cameras. The entire speech was spelled out in letters two-inches high. The result, evidently, was impressive. Critic Philip Hamburger was moved to say, "To put it conservatively the General was magnificent."

One of the largest audiences of 1953 was that attracted by the televising of the all-day proceedings of the Inauguration, January 20, and President Eisenhower's Inaugural Speech at noon. His unique contribution to television, however, may be the popularizing of the informal, family-type parlor conversations. Planned by the New York advertising agency, Batten-Barton-Durstine-&Osborne, such discussions were employed during the campaign with actor Conrad Nagel moderating and Mr. Eisenhower as a guest. One such telecast since the Inauguration has been widely noted, that in which President Eisenhower himself served as moderator or "host" with three guests: Federal Security Administrator Oveta Culp Hobby, Attorney General Herbert Brownell and Secretary of the Treasury George Humphries.

#### PRINCIPLES OF TELEVISION SPEAKING

It seems apparent that there is a substantial accumulation of experience in this new field of television speaking. The question next arises, is there an art of television speechmaking, and, if so, does it differ from speechmaking without television cameras? From a study of the reactions of professional television critics, three principles, at least, seem to have evolved:

1. Naturalness and sincerity represent the first requisite.
2. There is no substitute for "savvy."
3. "Gimmicks," originally believed essential, have proved not to be particularly necessary.

#### SINCERITY

Many speech teachers are fond of the term "adjustment." They define this as "the manner in which the speaker adapts his personality to the speaking situation." Any number of factors may be included: genuineness, sincerity, naturalness, composure, directness, and others. These factors are proving to be the prime essential for effectiveness in television speaking.

Perhaps a paragon of genuineness in television speaking was the then Vice-President Alben Barkley on the night of July 23, 1952, when he addressed the Democratic convention in Chicago. That day, as the papers reported it, Labor had ruled him out as too old. It was decided quickly, in order that he might bow out gracefully, to let him address the convention. He took the rostrum and explained that because of the sudden notice he would have to speak "off the cuff." He went on to say that his friends sometimes told him he spoke better that way, because it was "from the heart." After that he delivered a stirring sixty-minute address "off the cuff and from the heart."

In its report on Bishop Sheen, *Time* magazine narrated an interesting anecdote on naturalness. As a freshman debater for his college, St. Viator of Illinois, Sheen was selected to meet Notre Dame. But the honor faded the night before the debate when Sheen's coach scorned his ability and made him repeat one paragraph of his speech for an hour. The coach then asked Sheen to analyze his own fault. "Sheen thought hard," the article reported, "and said: 'I'm not natural.' St. Viator's won the debate. Sheen has been determinedly natural ever since."

Jack Gould commented on the naturalness of President Truman at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in March, 1952: "A viewer was struck at the outset by the President's relaxed manner, joviality and broad smile. . . for the evening he was in politics, which always brought out the true Truman personality."

Harry Harris, critic for the *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, quoted John Daly talking about himself:

Some letters say approvingly that I'm not overbearing toward the people who appear with me and that I seem to take things in stride, without tension. That's not calculated on my part. Just the result, I guess, of years as a reporter, trying to put others at ease while seeking information.

Philip Hamburger applauded Naturalist John Kieran's demeanor on television: "He is utterly

unpretentious, which makes him almost a freak on television." Hamburger called Kieran's program, "curiously comfortable, old-fashioned, and sensible. . . old-fashioned . . . meaning. . . it is clear, peaceful and educational. One looks, listens, and learns. He is not only behind the times but, God willing, ahead of them."

Jack Gould strongly favored the informal, on-the-spot question-answering of Thomas Dewey in his 1950 "telethon." "This form of campaign had a two-fold effect," said Mr. Gould, "First, it humanized Thomas E. Dewey as he had never been humanized before. . . Secondly, and more importantly, it eliminated the normal pomposities of political rhetoric. A man thinking on his feet is likely to blurt out the truth rather than the well-rounded, wind-filled phrase."

When the elections came up two years later, Mr. Gould was still pleading for genuineness, naturalness and sincerity. Although he lamented that television "has certainly pointed up the drab state of the art of oratory in contemporary political life," he concluded his review on a happier note. He suggested that the presidential candidates, Eisenhower and Stevenson, "are not practitioners of the old school of oratory. Essentially, they both recognize the merit of understatement, have a way with words, appreciate humorous relief and *are at their best when on their own.*" (Italics supplied.) Smith, Kline and French Laboratories, who have pioneered color television with closed-circuit medical telecasts, drew some conclusions on presentation. Dr. Kendall A. Elsom, Associate Professor of Clinical Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania, said that the staff recommended to participants: "Don't attempt a didactic lecture in front of a television camera"; and, "don't be too formal. It is best not to try to memorize or read a speech."

In achieving effective "adjustment" to his television audience, the critics are agreed that the speaker must create the impression of *directness*. When Philip Hamburger asserted that General Eisenhower's NATO speech was magnificent, he went on to say: "He spoke briskly, clearly, forcefully, and without bombast. He looked the camera (*i. e.* the public) straight in the eye—unmistakably a man who had nothing to hide."

An article special to *The New York Times*, datelined London and printed October 17, 1951, described the genuineness of a British speaker:

Anthony Eden. . . bids fair tonight to become the television star of the nation. . . Mr. Eden addressed 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 British

voters in a simple, straightforward political telecast that won praise from experts and home viewers alike.

. . . Viscount Samuel, spokesman for the Liberal Party. . . read his speech for fifteen minutes in a performance that the newspapers today described as sincere, but dull.

Mr. Eden. . . made his most notable impression at the end. Turning his eyes directly to the camera, he forecast that a conservative victory would bring an upsurge in confidence not only at home, but throughout the world.

John Crosby wrote of Adlai Stevenson in early April, 1952: "Governor Stevenson. . . on 'Meet the Press'. . . came off. . . very well. He was candid—or as candid as office seekers ever get; he looked his inquisitors straight in the eye. . ." The Smith, Kline and French television staff say simply: "Don't forget the camera during a presentation. . . Most speakers find it hard to look into the camera, and hence appear to be avoiding the eyes of the audience."

It seems reasonable to conclude from the foregoing that the successful television speaker must create the impression of sincerity, genuineness and naturalness and that he can achieve this by such attributes as unpretentiousness, directness and cutting loose from canned manuscripts and rote memorization to stand on his own.

#### "SAVVY"

The critics seem to agree that it is not enough for the speaker to be genuine. He must, in addition, have something to communicate. He must reflect knowledge and competence. A concise illustration of this principle is John Crosby's appraisal of Estes Kefauver, the Crime Investigator, and Estes Kefauver, the Presidential aspirant:

Let us pass on to Senator Estes Kefauver, who used television skillfully (though unwittingly) in the Kefauver hearings, but isn't using it that way anymore.

In the Kefauver hearings, the Senator from Tennessee was again the man-at-work. He handled the hearings quietly, judiciously, impartially; he was a man doing a tough job well. Since then he has become a presidential candidate, and now the picture has changed entirely. Kefauver, far from being the man at work, is now the man on the street corner with nothing on his mind except the presidency, a sort of upper class idler, sticking out his hand and saying: 'My name is Senator Kefauver. I hope you'll vote for me.'

Mr. Crosby had eulogized Thomas Dewey's "telethon" in 1950. Crosby suggested that President Franklin Roosevelt was "conceivably the Number One radio personality of all time," and that "all subsequent candidates have used television as if it were radio. They stood in front of a microphone and delivered a speech as melli-



fluently as possible, hoping that the pancake makeup would conceal their double chins." Then Mr. Crosby went on to imply that as Roosevelt understood radio, Dewey seemed to grasp the nature of television. Dewey was praised for speaking extemporaneously, for being thoroughly natural and informal, and for being vigorous ("never once did he sit behind the desk") and spontaneous. But most of all, he was praised for "savvy":

Essentially, though, he answered questions—hundreds of them—questions about state taxes, housing, veterans benefits, hospitals, and a dozen other complex questions. He answered them in awe-inspiring detail, spouting figures and facts without hesitation, and rarely—except in obvious slips of the tongue—making mistakes.

Jack Gould endorsed the importance of knowledge and competence when he became disturbed with "gimmicks" and tricky visual effects. He contended that such efforts overlook "the true magic of television, which is the transmission into the home of the human equation. . . how a picture is shown is important, but infinitely more important is what is said or done by the person appearing on the screen."

*Time* magazine asserted that the success of Bishop Sheen's television speeches depends upon the presentation of provocative ideas. Answering negatively the question, "Greatest Actor?", *Time* contended that what he has to say on television "is not dogma, but a mixture of common sense, logic and Christian ethics. Says Sheen: ' . . . People want to be good. But they want reasons.' . . . He speaks for 28 minutes straight. . . without even a written outline, he produces facts, dates, six-digit statistics, with the precision of an electronic calculator."

"Savvy," then seems to be a second essential for the effective television speaker. He must create the impression of mastery of his subject and the ability to discuss it without "crutches." Mr. Crosby spoke of one speaker who "displayed a professional urbanity and an appearance of competence which," Mr. Crosby believed, "will be the hallmark of the television politicians of the future." Let us not restrict it to politicians. Let us make those characteristics the hallmark of television speakers of the future.

#### GIMMICKS NOT REQUIRED

The third principle of television speechmaking is perhaps less firmly established than the first two. It is that visual aids or gimmicks, believed by many at the outset to be absolutely essential, have not proved necessary. On the other hand

there is evidence of effective use of visual materials in television speechmaking.

Dwight Cooke, a veteran discussion moderator for the CBS network, was one of those who heralded visual aids in the early days of television. In an article printed in *Variety*, Mr. Cooke said:

. . . TV is even more exciting to those of us who struggle with public affairs and educational radio (than to dancers, comedians, etc., to whom TV is plenty exciting). For the first time in our lives we can stop talking about things. . . . Up to now we have been hamstrung by our knowledge that the human brain can retain very few facts or technical pieces of information it receives via the ear. Just try to tell a man how to repair a carburetor without drawing a picture.

(Now) we can show you just why more dollars in circulation mean higher prices. . . . We can concoct toy models and graphs and thermometers which go into action while you watch and let you see the real facts instead of expecting you to just listen to our generalities.

Speaking for Smith, Kline and French Laboratories' experience in medical televising, Dr. Kendall A. Elsom seemed to concur with Mr. Cooke, "An effective color television program depends upon the pictorial presentation of the subjects discussed, and without the pictorial element television adds little." It was simply assumed that special visual materials should be used:

Don't assume that the conventional visual aids to which you are accustomed, such as lantern slides, charts, etc., are equally effective in a lecture room and before a television camera. In the first instance slides are enlarged; in the second, they are reduced on the television screen. Therefore, charts should be simple, should have heavy block lettering 1½ inches high, and should utilize color wherever feasible. Most charts are too complex, too detailed, and too small for television programs.

There are, in addition, many examples of effective uses of visual materials. Bishop Fulton Sheen has carried out, in a homely way, some of the recommendations of Mr. Cooke. *Time* magazine reported: "He uses no props except a blackboard on which he draws an occasional simple diagram. . . His favorite joke: whenever a stagehand, out of camera range, wipes off his blackboard, Sheen refers to 'my little angel.' Sheen has made the 'angel' into what the trade calls a running gag."

The special report to *The New York Times*, which billed Anthony Eden as a rising television star, said in part, "Using a simple chart he demonstrated that the cost of living steadily had grown more serious since the Labor Government took office in 1945."

On the other side of this issue, however, are three points—1) there is strong critical reaction

against *contrived* usage of visual materials; 2) many authorities now theorize that visual aids simply are not necessary; and 3) needed or not needed, good or bad, visual materials simply are infrequently used by television speakers.

Probably the most vigorous critic of television's fanaticism with regard to visual trappings is Jack Gould. He described the situation as follows: "A blind determination to keep the television screen filled with action is getting out of hand in video production. . . . such techniques often serve only to clutter up good programs and camouflage inadequacies." Mr. Gould did not blame the directors alone. He said, "In part the trend stems from the ridiculous premise of the whole industry that a viewer will tune out instantly if there is not something doing on the screen every minute."

Another comment by Mr. Gould pretty well sums up point number two, *i. e.*, that visual aids simply are not necessary:

If the person, whether in speech or play, is inherently interesting, the idea of a preconceived time limit on a given 'shot' is nonsense. If the person is a bore by reason of his dull remarks or poor script, no hocus-pocus by a camera director will materially change the situation.

In the early months of 1951, the writer made a study of network television discussion programs. Interviewing most of the persons prominently associated with such programs as "American Forum of the Air," "Mrs. Roosevelt Meets the Public," "Meet the Press," "People's Platform," "On Trial" and "Court of Current Issues," the writer found that the great majority considered the use of visual materials unnecessary. Most observed that the use of visual aids was acceptable and in many cases advantageous, but that the essential visual interest had to be in the speakers themselves — in their appearances, their demeanors, their facial expressions, reactions, etc.

In conclusion, the present status of this issue of visual aids usage seems to lie in point number three, *i. e.*, that needed or not needed, good or

bad, visual aids are used by only a small minority of television speakers. Perhaps the most reasonable conclusion to draw is that, contrary to early beliefs, visual aids are not essential to effective television speaking, but that many television speakers have used visual aids effectively, and that many other speeches might be improved by good visual devices.

#### FORMULA FOR SUCCESS

When your opportunity comes to be a television speaker or when you next sit down in front of your set in the role of a television critic, keep these things in mind. There has been a parade of speakers in television's few years, among them: Thomas Dewey, Estes Kefauver, Rudolph Halley, Bishop Sheen, Harry Truman, Douglas MacArthur, Richard Nixon, Adlai Stevenson, Dwight Eisenhower. Several respected television critics have reacted to this speechmaking—such critics as John Crosby, Jack Gould and Philip Hamburger. From this critical reaction certain principles have evolved which we can apply as criteria — as speakers and as critics. As television speakers we must be our unpretentious selves: genuine, natural, sincere and straightforward. We must possess "savvy" — displaying competence both in having ideas and communicating them. We should realize that visual aids or gimmicks are not necessary, that the principal visual appeal must lie in the speaker himself, although visual materials may be used to advantage.

Television lights, cameras, microphones and crews create a barrier of confusion and distraction between the speaker and his imagined audience. It is his job to visualize that audience and to communicate with it simply by directing his conversation at the lens of the television camera when its little red bulb lights up. If he has something to say that is provocative and challenging, that will touch off a whole chain of desired responses, some electronic but mostly distinctly human.

# Ghostwriting: Ancient and Honorable

By Walter J. Stelkovich

In the 1952 campaign the presidential and vice-presidential candidates delivered a combined total of nearly one thousand speeches.<sup>1</sup> This huge number of speeches was possible only because of the extensive use of ghostwriters. Many Americans were aware of the fact that the four men could not prepare so many speeches unaided. Yet, when one mentions the word ghostwriter immediate suspicion is aroused. Rarely does a kind word fall from the lips of a non-ghost. Typical is the anecdote told about the man who was hired as a ghostwriter. He went home and, afraid to tell his wife about his new work, told her he had been hired as a television writer.

Ghostwriting agencies are listed in a large number of telephone directories and many people use their services. One university offers a course in ghostwriting. In the main, the speech profession ignores its existence. The *QJS* has never condemned or approved it although two articles on Roosevelt obliquely acknowledge its use.

There should be no objection to the profession which has had an ancient, and primarily honest, past. A brief look at this past helps to explain some of the reasons for popular mistrust and also furnishes reasons for long-needed recognition.

The Greeks and Romans were early practitioners of the art according to Stern: "The Athenian citizens engaged one Lysias to write speeches adapted to their character and stations so that they could convincingly present their claims. Demosthenes prepared orations for the leading politicians of his day. In Rome, Julius Caesar employed a pair of ghosts named Oppius and Hirtius to write the *Commentaries*; Seneca, in Nero's time, authored his sovereign's orations."<sup>2</sup>

One of the most popular forms of ghostwriting appeared during the Renaissance. Shakespeare was a notorious re-writer of other men's tales. The literary efforts of Dryden, Addison, and Pope were often revisions or adaptations of earlier classical works. Even Coleridge and Dickens were not entirely self-sufficient.

Nineteenth century ghostwriting reached its apex in the person of, "... Alexander Dumas, who tossed off some 1,200 published works. It is obvious that he could not have written them all without assistance, and it is notorious that he employed no fewer than a dozen ghosts. He

founded a fiction factory that is still one of the wonders of literature."<sup>3</sup> Such efforts as his were accepted largely without quarrel. Later imitation of his system, however, led to abuses which necessitated reform.

It became the practice of non-literary notables, such as travelers, military men and sports figures, to publish their memoirs. These memoirs were written by ghostwriters who had far better command of the language than did the heroes being written about. For some time the books appeared as the work of the hero but gradually the practice of including the byline, "as told to" came into use. Thus, in the literary world, ghostwriters achieved a new status. A classic example of the new trend can be found in the dedication of an autobiography by the late Charles Michelson. One of the most famous New Deal ghostwriters, Mr. Michelson wrote, "to three fine friends who, under the guise of secretaries, saved me from errors, guided and guarded me, straightened out my complications, and generally smoothed my professional path. . . this book is dedicated."<sup>4</sup>

A quickly condemned "literary" application made its appearance long ago and is still with us. It worked as this advertisement indicates: "We write it. *You* sign it. Speeches, reports, dissertations, theses. Satisfaction guaranteed. Reasonable rates. *We* write it. *You* sign it."<sup>5</sup> Although a few students still rely on this type of subterfuge for survival, their number is too limited to require serious concern.

A common misconception is that ghostwriting in American politics began with the New Deal. This is not accurate. It is true that, "it remained for Franklin D. Roosevelt to bring ghostwriting into prominence by employing such eminent men as Judge Samuel Rosenman, Playwright Robert Sherwood, Brain Truster Raymond Moley and Poet Archibald MacLeish."<sup>6</sup> However, a year before Roosevelt began to campaign for the 1932 presidency, one source wrote, "we might remark that the practice of ghostwriting. . . has become widespread in recent years."<sup>7</sup> Gilroy writing in 1949, did not really delve into the history when he said, "this is a comparatively new thing, such general dependence of public men upon ghost-written speeches. It burgeoned in obscurity somewhere during the years between the time when



Woodrow Wilson made notable speeches with only occasional glances at notes and the time when Franklin D. Roosevelt began to read his eloquent 'fireside talks'. . . ."<sup>8</sup>

That ghostwriting is not new to politics or U. S. presidents can be seen in the words of Stern: "Near the end of the 18th century, a distinguished soldier-statesman had something important to say. . . . The general idea and thoughts of the speech were those of the man who delivered it; the magnificent wording was all Alexander Hamilton's. That speech has never been forgotten. It is Washington's Farewell Address. . . ."

Other presidential beneficiaries of ghostly assistance were mentioned by Bendiner, who said: "McKinley's messages are believed to have been the work of John Hay, his Secretary of State. A brilliant message of Andrew Johnson's is to be found in the archives in the handwriting of George Bancroft, the famous historian. Harding and Coolidge shared a ghost, who shrewdly adapted himself to their different personalities.

"Fortunately there are. . . few, at least in high places who will take the order supposedly given to William Henry Harrison by his presidential campaign managers—under no circumstances to utter a word on his own about political principles or program."<sup>9</sup> Such restriction, if true, is to be deplored as is the violation of a major principle for effective speech reported by Bendiner: "New York's Mayor, John F. Hylan. . . frequently made his first acquaintance with a speech in the course of delivering it. . . . The story is told. . . his honor came upon a joke he had never heard before. He laughed so hard that he broke his glasses and an aide had to finish reading the speech." At first, the story is amusing, but it should be remembered that there was no real communication of ideas here, simply a masquerade performance of another's ideas. This, unfortunately, is the type of association commonly made with ghostwriting.

What are some guiding principles to follow in judging the acceptability of ghostwriting? Aristotle supplied one, "Whatever the subject on which we have to speak or reason—whether the argument concerns public affairs or anything else—we must have some knowledge, if not a complete one, of the facts." The speaker cannot always acquire these facts unaided.

Bendiner, quoting J. Douglas Knox who teaches ghostwriting at American University, supplied another guiding principle, "the writer must know the man whose words he is to create. He must know how his speaker thinks, reacts, and naturally

expresses himself. . . .

"Before he puts finger to the typewriter, the good ghost will have sat down with his speaker and gone over the subject to be covered until he knows exactly how his man feels. He must literally put himself in the other's frame of mind."

The pattern outlined by Knox is one which is quite often used. Roosevelt followed a slightly different procedure when he was Governor of New York. According to Michelson, Hugh Johnson, Raymond Moley, and Michelson would appear at the Governor's mansion with individual interpretations of a theme outlined by Roosevelt. These would invariably be rejected. After individual drafts were again worked out, the men would return for a "brief discussion" and then Roosevelt would dictate his own version, "using some of our phrases but generally culling the best ideas that had been submitted and putting them in his own way." Michelson said that this was typical of all of Roosevelt's speech preparation.

Adlai Stevenson, by his own admission a ghostwriter for the late Secretary of the Navy Knox, himself relied on ghosts in the presidential campaign and while Governor of Illinois. For a time, Carl McGowan was his "top policy adviser." Some of the implications of this title were that, "he digests. . . material. . . talks it over with the Governor, suggests phrases and sometimes himself prepares early drafts of the speeches.

"In the end, the material, texts and phrases provided in this way are rather thoroughly rewritten by the Governor. He edits and cuts repeatedly, fits the whole into his quite personal literary style."<sup>10</sup>

President Eisenhower also used ghostwriters in an acceptable manner in the 1952 campaign. Morris supplied details:

"Many times he marked out and rewrote paragraph after paragraph of a prepared address until the first draft was virtually unrecognizable. Frequently five or six drafts were necessary before he was satisfied and sometimes he tore a whole speech apart and revamped it a few hours before delivery."<sup>11</sup>

It is clear that ghostwriters perform a useful and honorable service. Due recognition has been delayed excessively. Pessimists have held sway for so long that many believe these words which Seneca Johnson<sup>12</sup> held invalid:

"As long ago as. . . 1932. . . a writer. . . devoted several thousand words. . . to dismal predictions of national political and moral collapse on the ground that things had come to a pretty pass

when it was possible for a political wheel-horse to hire a scholar to write his speeches."<sup>13</sup>

No collapse has occurred, and just as in past centuries, there is little likelihood that ghost-writing will induce moral decay.

- 1 The New York Times, November 3, 1952.
- 2 Edith M. Stern, "The Cash-and-no-Credit Business," *Saturday Review of Literature*, 23:11-12, October 26, 1940.
- 3 Bennett Cerf, "Trade Winds," *Saturday Review of Literature*, 27:18, August 19, 1944.
- 4 Charles Michelson, *The Ghost Talks*, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1944.
- 5 Harry W. Hastings, "Homer's Wink," *College English* 5:14-9-52, December, 1943.
- 6 "The Trouble With Ghosts," *Time*, 54:25, December 5, 1949.
- 7 *Wilson Bulletin For Librarians*, 5:595-6, May, 1931.
- 8 Harry Gilroy, "Survey of the Ghost Writers," *New York Times Sunday Magazine*, March 27, 1949.
- 9 Robert Bendiner, "Ghosts Behind the Speechmakers," *New York Times Sunday Magazine*, August 17, 1952.

- 10 "Stevenson's Ghost Writers," *U. S. News and World Report*, 33:57-9, September 26, 1952.
- 11 Joe Alex Morris, "What Kind of President Will Ike Make?" *Saturday Evening Post*, 225:20, January 3, 1953.
- 12 Seneca, as noted previously, and Dr. Samuel Johnson were both ghostwriters. The names provided J. K. Atkins with a pseudonym for his articles on ghostwriting.
- 13 Seneca Johnson, "In Defense of Ghost Writing," *Harpers*, 179:536-43, October, 1939.

EDITORIAL NOTE:—"Ghost writing" continues to intrigue commentators of the contemporary scene. In the November, 1953, issue of the *American Scholar*, Ernest R. May discusses the question at length from the point of view of the historian. How, he asks, can a historian reach reliable conclusions about the true character of a historic leader if doubt exists concerning the authorship of the words and indeed the sentiments ascribed to him? "Examples could be taken from any era," writes May, "to show how ghostwritten sources have built an impenetrable thicket around the truth. Two generations of scholars have quarreled about the meaning of Washington's Farewell Address, simply because no one knows whether Washington himself or Alexander Hamilton was the author." Similarly, "If, on the basis of letters and speeches, a scholar should try to analyze Franklin Roosevelt's mind, he would emerge with a figure made up of Roosevelt and the fragments of Roosevelt's ghost. . . ."

## How Is Your Child's Speech?

By Frank Westley Merritt

The chances are that you, as a parent, will never be faced with the problem of caring for a child with delayed speech. Most children learn to speak without great difficulty. Yet most parents, while little Johnny or Mary is between the ages of eighteen months and six years, experience at some time just a bit of anxiety about their youngster's speech. Johnny, aged three, doesn't speak nearly so well as Susan, next door, also aged three. Mary, aged four and a half, still says "w" for "I" "wight" for "light" omits her "r's," and confuses "s" and "th," saying "sing" for "thing" and "think" for "sink." She sounds cute, but sometimes others have difficulty understanding her. A neighbor's child, aged four, has yet to say a two-syllable word: still says "wa" for "water." "What about these children?" parents ask, "Do they have speech problems? When should a parent become worried enough about his child's speech to seek help?"

The answer to these questions is that these represent not "speech problems" but only individual children. Each child will learn and grow at his own rate. We can, however make a few general statements that will help you to determine how your child's speech compares with that of other children of his age.

The "average" child begins to talk, that is uses words meaningfully, between twelve and eighteen months of age. If at the age of three your child has no speech at all, or perhaps uses gestures and a few grunts and squeaks to communicate his desires, his speech is delayed. If at the age of

five your child's speech is so distorted that he has a language of his own which only his family can understand, his speech is also delayed. He needs help. Only a few weeks ago a bright child of six and a half was referred to me whose speech, completely unintelligible, contained such bizarre pronunciations as "leunk" for "lamp," "sam" for "sun," "beth" for "bus," and "muhgu" for "mother"—to mention only a few. His parents had hoped that when he entered school he would learn to speak, but the expected miracle had failed to occur. His teacher could scarcely understand him and his schoolmates were beginning to make fun of him.

Some inaccuracies in the speech of normal children can be expected, of course, through their eighth year. The "average" child has not mastered the difficult "th" sound in "that," the "sh" sound in "should," or the "l" sound in "light" before he is six and a half. The "s" sound in "sing," the "z" sound in "because," the "r" sound in "ring," and "th" in "thin" are not mastered by the "average" child before seven and a half. Only if these errors persist in the speech of a nine or ten year old is there a speech problem. It is well to know that girls are likely to be ahead of boys at least six months in all aspects of language: pronunciation, vocabulary, and sentence structure.

What causes delayed development of a child's speech? Nature is at fault very often; parents only sometimes. Most children seem able to develop good speech despite their parents. Among the natural causes are low intelligence, about which little can be done, and poor auditory memory

span. Children with the latter type of difficulty seem unable to retain the sound quality and the "feel" of lip, tongue, and jaw position for more than one syllable at a time. They also forget how to say a word after a lapse of time. Though such children have normal intelligence, they seem unable to "play by ear" as most children do when they learn to speak and need special teaching to develop the knack.

Another natural cause is complete or partial deafness. About the fifth week of life, a child begins to babble, or to play with sounds. He coos, gurgles, sucks, smacks his lips, and forms most of the vowel and consonant sounds not only of English, but of all known languages and some unknown. At first he does this reflexively, because he feels contented and happy inside and likes the activity; but later, during his second six months, he gets pleasure from hearing himself talk. He coos, "ah"; prolongs it; slides it up and down the scale. Stimulated by his own ear to imitate himself, he will practice for hours double syllables like "da-da" and "ma-ma." The child born completely deaf, however, will babble for a while, but since he cannot hear himself his ear gives him no pleasure, and he soon becomes silent. If a healthy child indulges in little or no vocal play at the age of five months, better have him tested by an ear specialist (otologist). Another type of deafness, called high frequency deafness, will not prevent the child's hearing and learning the easily visible and the low frequency sounds, such as "p" and "b" and "w," but the less visible sounds such as "r" and "k," and the high-pitched ones, like "s" and "sh," may be very difficult for him to master. A specialist should test the child's hearing if such errors persist beyond the age of seven and a half years.

If a child suffers from prolonged illness during infancy, do not expect his speech to develop at the normal rate. He will lack the physical vigor and contentment necessary for pleasurable babbling. If he is confined to a hospital, his surroundings will not stimulate him to speak. The hospital routine requires little speech. Children won't learn to talk unless talking is necessary.

It is at this point that parents enter as a contributing cause for delayed speech, for many children, are not motivated to speak. Not long ago I visited at a home which had a gravely silent child of three and a half, who had been severely ill between the ages of one and two. When he wished a drink of water he stood near the sink, and the anxious, adoring mother instantly drew a

glass. When he was hungry, he stood near the refrigerator, and mother immediately threw open the door. That child was bright, brighter than his parents. Why make the effort to speak when one is getting such deluxe service? On the other hand, some parents, not too many fortunately, consciously or unconsciously dislike their children. Perhaps their child was unwanted to begin with, or it might be ugly, or disfigured, or weak. Such parents show their dislike by ignoring needs and requests by severe punishments, and by constant nagging and criticism. The rejected child may well fall silent, for no one loves him and nothing he does is right. The parents, not the child, need treatment. Parents must also be wise when a second child arrives. The first may feel jealous and resentful and show its feelings by silence or a regression to "baby talk." Every effort must be made to show the first child that it is loved and appreciated as much as the new baby.

Parents sometimes also delay speech by poor teaching. When baby begins to derive pleasure from his babbling and to imitate himself, the parents should prolong his interest by interrupting his babble and imitating both his sounds and his physical actions, such as pounding on his tray as he says "ma-ma." The first step in teaching speech is accomplished when baby, in turn, becomes interested in what the parent is doing and imitates him. There should be plenty of this when the *child*, not the parents, feels the urge. Later, when he has an interval of silence during his babbling, the parents should stimulate him with syllables like "da-da" or "ma-ma."

When the child breaks his silence to imitate his parent the second step in teaching speech has been achieved. Such syllables should always be vocalized when the appropriate parent is present. One memorable day the child will say "ma-ma" and in some way, perhaps by reaching toward the parent, indicate he wants his mother. He has then said his first word, for the little tyrant now knows that "ma-ma" stands for his parent and can be used to fetch her whenever he wants her. Other words are taught in the same way. A ball, a doll, or other object is presented with vocalization. The child cannot have it unless he vocalizes an approximation of the word. Parents must not expect perfection. If the child says "ba" or "daw" for "ball" and "doll" accept it. The first words should be simple monosyllables—teach him "bike," not "bicycle"—and give him only a few at a time. After all, he's a baby even though you think him a genius. These first words also should be said



alone, or placed at the beginning or end of a short sentence, not buried like this "Do you want to ride the bike with Mother and Daddy?" Talk with the child regularly each day, but not all day long. The child is human; he'll get bored. Don't nag; praise. Make speaking a rewarding, pleasurable activity.

If your child has speech markedly different from that of other children of similar age and health, don't worry about it, but don't feel sure that he will outgrow it; he may, or he may not. If he doesn't, the difficult adjustments to school will be enormously complicated by the problem of being understood by his teachers and his playmates. He may also be penalized socially by being ridiculed or by being thought, unjustly, to be stupid.

Do the reasonable thing. Check over your own teaching of the child. Is he motivated to speak? Is he over or under-stimulated? Are your standards too high? Do you scold and nag? If you can't honestly blame yourself, and most often you are not to blame, then consult a speech specialist. Perhaps your school system employs one. But make sure he's qualified. There are lots of quacks. To make sure, write to the American Speech and Hearing Association, Dr. George Kopp, Speech Clinic, Wayne University, Detroit, Michigan and ask him to recommend a professional correctionist who lives near you. Between the two of you, much good can be done for your child's speech.

## Helping Paul To Hear

By Harriet M. Dunn

### INTRODUCTION

The following account of the beginnings of formal education for Paul by a teacher not trained in special education, but well grounded in her concepts of education for the whole child, shows what can be done educationally in a rural community for a school age child with a severe hearing loss.

A short review of Paul's development history, and a description of his acoustic training as a preschool child, will make the teacher's report more meaningful.

As an infant Paul was rather tiny, seemed to need more care, and to progress more slowly than the other children in the family. At six years of age he was still small for his age but was well, strong, wiry, and a dynamo of energy, curiosity and interest in what went on about him. These last factors got him into much trouble before the family was made aware of his hearing loss because they produced behavior which was called inattention, stubbornness, disobedience, etc. Even after Paul had been labeled "hard of hearing" by an otologist, the family found it difficult to accept this diagnosis and tried to believe improvement would come with removal of the tonsils as he grew older, etc.

Although the otologist referred Paul for examination to the Diagnostic Speech and Hearing Clinic of the Vermont Association for the Crippled, the parents delayed more than a year, as they clung to their vain hopes for his improvement. So

it was at the age of five that Paul first came to the clinic, a small, shy, frightened youngster, dependent upon his parents, whose eager faces showed their determination to have "something done".

Excerpts from the clinic report describe him as having severe chronic *otitis media* with a hearing loss. Recommendations were (1) acoustic training which should begin without delay and (2) radium treatment for removal of lymphoid tissue in the nasopharynx.

Once the parents were convinced that Paul had some usable residual hearing which could be trained and that he could attain speech within normal range, the entire family with great enthusiasm entered upon this training period which was set up for him by the Vermont Association for the Crippled. Because they live on a farm far from town, visits to the otologist for radium treatments were planned on the days Paul came to the Center for training. As a unit the family (father, mother, brother, two sisters, and the baby) came along to class and became a real part of the teaching situations as they, with Paul, participated in the class activities. Thus, an immediate and real carry-over of learning from school to home was effected. This family interest and participation has continued and increased.

Acoustic training for Paul consists of (1) training in listening through amplification of music and speech by means of a desk hearing aid, (2) lipreading, and (3) speech training. Introduction

to the use of the desk aid was made carefully in order that he receive only pleasant experiences while listening to amplified sound. By his shining eyes, eagerness to use it, and his care of the instrument we could understand the pleasure it gave him right from the first. In a few lessons he was able to assume responsibility for plugging it into the wall socket, putting on the headphones, and adjusting the volume to a level comfortable for him. He was provided with a similar aid for use at home to listen to the radio and television, to practice his speech lessons.

During the winter of 1949 Paul attended class once a week and during the summer of 1950 he had intensive training in individual and group classes for five weeks. In this time he made considerable gain in the use of speech and his ability to listen and to lipread.

In the fall of 1950 he started to school in a rural district, but his lack of language and his ability to become part of a large group proved a problem to the other children and to the teacher. After the first month he was removed from the school and placed in the care of a teacher whose account of his progress follows.

#### PAUL AT SCHOOL

*By Christine LaDuke McCloskey*

Tutoring a child with a severe hearing loss is a new experience for me and limited to one child. My relationship with Paul began last August (1950) when I tutored him for a period of four weeks. School started again for us in October and continued daily for several months.

The method of teaching I have used has not varied too much from teaching a child with normal hearing. First, we must become acquainted by learning each other's name and recognizing our own in print or writing. Paul knew his first name and could recognize it in print, but he had to learn how to say his whole name, which five-year old children with normal hearing usually know. Next he learned how old he was and the date of his birthday. This sometimes has to be taught first grade children, too.

Next he learned the colors. Here the procedure was the same as the one I have used in teaching children in the first grade. A card was made from paper of the color I wanted to teach, size  $3\frac{1}{4}'' \times 9''$  with the name of the color printed in black on white, size  $3'' \times 4\frac{1}{2}''$ , pasted on the left side. I taught "red" first, then "blue", alternating with the light and dark colors, and with the names of those

that do not sound or look alike. Then on plain flash cards the name of the color was printed and matched to the colored cards. The lesson that taught a color was followed with seat work consisting of coloring objects, using the color learned. Gradually the words "color", "draw", "cut" and "paste" were introduced and pictures and names of objects within his experience.

Naturally, there had to be some variations. The desk hearing aid helped a great deal, as it amplified the sound of my voice while I introduced new words, gave directions, voiced approval or made corrections. While teaching, I sat so the light would be on my face, so that Paul could more readily read my lips. I tried to speak in a natural manner, using a conversational tone and a slightly slower rate than normal. Usually it was necessary to explain several times, until by his verbal or non-verbal responses he made me know he understood. Each lesson consisted of a careful gradation of the difficulty of the work so the child could have a series of successes, working from the known to the unknown.

Encouragement was necessary, but criticism, constructive and destructive, had to be honest and real. Paul had to learn to take both. I tried each time to find work, or a portion of work, worthy of praise, at the same time pointing out mistakes or work not so well done. If he hadn't tried, I frankly told him so. I firmly believe children instinctively know whether a person is sincere or not and respond accordingly. Paul is the type of child who, if he could "put one over on you", he would think it a big joke and continue to do so. However, he has worked very hard and really earned whatever praise has been given him.

The procedure can be summarized as follows: (a) Set a high standard of work; our goal here is the one for grade one in the Vermont State Courses of Study. We probably cannot reach our goal in all subjects but we try very hard to reach it especially in reading and arithmetic.

(b) Give clear, concise directions, making sure they are understood by the child. This is done by using short sentences, with words to the point and easily understood by the child. Sometimes an illustration, first by the teacher, then by the child, helps to show what is expected perhaps by such a method as associating a name, Bill, with a picture of Bill. Tracing a name with his fingers, then with a crayon and underlining the word "Bill" each time he sees it, helps to associate the printed word with the object or action.

(c) Show disapproval when necessary, but try

to let each day end with something the child enjoys doing so he may have a feeling of success and look forward to returning the next day.

During the first four weeks Paul was tutored, he learned the written names of the colors and the matching of them. The Basic Reading Program used in our town is by Nila Banton Smith, entitled, "Learning to Read," made up of several books and work books. The first, "Our First Book," with an accompanying practice pad, is used to introduce those reading experiences that are best initiated through the use of colored pictures. Since Paul lacked the ability to express or relate his experiences, this was not very interesting to him; so we went on to the next book, "Bill and Susan", pre-primer I, accompanied by the "Read and Do" work book. We did not use the work book at this time, only the pre-primer. Paul seemed very much interested in these pictures, with their words under each picture. He had learned that his name was Paul so it was easy for him to understand that Bill was the name of the boy on the first page in his book. At the end of the four weeks he could read the first fifteen pages and twelve of the twenty-six different words were introduced. He counted to 10 with help.

Paul entered school, on trial, in September and attended for five weeks. At the end of the five weeks Paul came back to me to take up where we had left off.

In two and one half months of instruction, Paul has worked hard and made satisfactory progress. He has completed "Bill and Susan", and that part of the work book that accompanies it. He has read about two thirds of the pre-primer 2, "Under the Tree", and has done the work in the work book. Many times he has trouble sounding or pronouncing correctly the letters of words he cannot see formed on the lips: for example—go, good, and other throat sounds. Paul and I were both thrilled when he mastered the word go, after working on it for some time. Many times, after hearing the word a number of times, with his hearing aid, he pronounces it correctly.

Paul has used another pre-primer Seat Work Book which helped to add seven more words to his vocabulary. Another Primer Seat Work Book added and reviewed sixteen more words.

In arithmetic he has attempted counting to 100, but he still required some assistance here. In the book, "How Many? How Much?" by Patton Young, he has had experience in writing numbers and counting.

In his various school subjects I have tried to teach Paul in the same manner he would be taught in any school, plus trying to make sure he hears and understands what is expected.

This story of Paul would not be quite complete without Paul's Christmas experience. Of course Paul has attended Church and School Christmas Exercises many times, but has never heard them. This year a teacher-friend arranged an extension cord and a front seat for Paul, and with the help of his desk hearing aid he heard the children speak and sing for the first time. Words cannot describe the pleasure written on his face, nor his joy in talking to Santa Claus, really talking and hearing!

#### *A Postscript—THE NEXT THREE YEARS*

In the fall of 1951 a class for children with hearing loss was opened at the Children's Rehabilitation Center of the Vermont Association for the Crippled, Inc. and Paul was selected as a member of it. As it was too far from his home for daily commuting he was placed in a specially chosen foster home where he lives from Sunday evening to Friday evenings after school.

Many factors made this first year a difficult one: (1) living away from home; (2) adjusting to a group of children in school for class work and play; (3) learning to use and care for his individual hearing aid; (4) intensive training in speech, listening and lip reading; and (5) competition experience in group learning of school subjects.

Of these factors the most difficult were (1) adjustment at work, play and in the classroom and (2) combating competition in play. Paul is small in stature and when compared with other children his age looked and acted at least three years younger. Because of this it was difficult to see his behavior in its true light and the staff had to learn how to disregard his immature behavior and help him learn to react in ways more appropriate to his years.

The second year many of the difficulties were ironed out and a vision defect was corrected with glasses. He made 1.8 years progress in 1 year as measured by The Nebraska Test of Learning. While he still had problems such as excessive aggressiveness to cover up inadequacy in size and inability to compete equally, he made enough progress so that Paul was selected to return in the fall of 1953 for special education with his group.

At present, in the fall of his third year, Paul has shown remarkable progress in school learning, speech, listening and lip reading. He is now working at a rate considered by the staff to be



more appropriate to his abilities. He uses speech which is much more understandable, wears and cares for his own hearing aid, takes pride in his successes, is much more acceptable to the group since he acts, learns and plays more as the other

members of it do.

Our goal is to have Paul return to his own public school within a year or more, able to compete with the boys and girls of his age in his community.

## Trends In Speech In The Eastern States

—Edited by: Carroll C. Arnold

### SECONDARY SCHOOL CURRICULA

In the first issue of TODAY'S SPEECH the following sentences appeared in this "column": "The placement and administration of Speech and Dramatics in the secondary school program is another subject which 'Trends' might review. Whither we tend will doubtless be determined by the goals, the 'ideal programs,' for which we strive and yearn. What is that program for Speech in the secondary school?" On the editor's desk there now stands an unfortunately small but nonetheless valuable pile of replies to this query. They constitute no comprehensive survey of trends in Speech education, but they seem worth reporting as evidence of the directions in which some at least among our colleagues are seeking to move.

Surprisingly, our correspondents are in full agreement on most of the fundamental matters. Without exception they believe that the program of *general* Speech improvement should be concentrated in the elementary school and, perhaps, the junior high school. They recommend a Speech program for the high school which begins with a basic course (preferably required of all students) which has as its staple the study of self expression in original discourse. These contributors also agree that the basic course should be supplemented by more specialized elective courses including, always, dramatics and debate or discussion. Most suggest that these elective courses be offered in the eleventh or twelfth years as alternatives to a semester or a year of the standard English course.

That these letters on our desk represent the feelings of a considerable number of secondary school teachers of Speech was impressed upon the editor of "Trends" when he recently visited Elmira, N. Y. to attend a meeting of the Speech Arts Section of the Southern Zone conference of New York state elementary and secondary teachers. A panel of college and high school teachers and the forty other teachers attending this meet-

ing appeared to agree fully with Mr. William Baldwin's (Homer, N. Y., Central School) letter from our mailbag:

"An integrated program of basic Speech training from the kindergarten is essential if the student's habits and complexes are not to be too firmly developed before he reaches the high school Speech teacher. Even a moderate sized school system, therefore, needs a regular Speech teacher for the seventh and eighth grades and a Speech supervisor to work in the elementary grades, guide the non-Speech teachers in the lower grades, and coordinate the work of all the pre-high school divisions. Such a program can lead reasonably toward a single required course in the high school."

The teachers who met in Elmira endorsed a similar program but, recognizing that it implied extensive co-ordination of Speech with other academic work at all levels, concluded that an ideal and integrated program can scarcely succeed without in-service Speech training for all non-Speech teachers upon whom Speech supervisors and instructors must rely for assistance. Although a few isolated attempts at such in-service training were cited, the consensus of the group was that this necessary adjunct to sound Speech education receives all too little attention as yet.

Both the letters received and the opinions expressed at the Elmira conference endorsed the proposition that Speech needs to be recognized as an independent discipline and to be taught by professionally trained teachers in classes devoted exclusively to that subject if a sound, general program is to emerge in the secondary school. These beliefs were in no sense products of academic isolationism, however. Miss Rita Lee Kramer of Plainfield (N. J.) High School expressed the typical view, writing: "The ideal Speech program must reach far beyond the Speech classroom. The student must be helped to apply his

Speech work in all of his school subjects and for this, interdepartmental co-operation is essential."

But what shall be the character of the basic Speech course which the qualified and independent Speech teacher should offer? One of the most interesting, because most controversial, inferences to be drawn from the letters reaching the "Trends" desk is that original speaking in public should be the central concern of the basic course in the high school. The fullest and most explicit description of this goal came from Mrs. Thelma Caruso of Charleroi (Pa.) Senior High School. The aims of the beginning course, says Mrs. Caruso, should be to teach students to understand the significance of "posture, audibility, directness, and composition" in oral communication. An appreciation of how these qualities affect listeners and a growth in dignity and self-respect as each latent ability is discovered—these are the rewards Mrs. Caruso promises the student in the course she describes. "When the speaker has learned to use position, voice, and directness fairly well, he is ready to learn something of Speech composition. He must learn to express thoughts in his own best way. However rough the plank be hewn at first, we must not permit him to be a plagiarist. We have no need to demand of him the polished phraseology he may be tempted to 'lift' from reference material. He must learn to talk his own thoughts, developing them through a beginning, a middle, and an ending. From here he may go on to greater perfection in organization until, perceiving the requirements of his material, audience, and occasion, he comes to appreciate what ideas deserve expression and how they can be best presented."

Not all teachers will agree that original discourse should hold the place of chief importance in the beginning high school course, but "Trends" has yet to receive any communication denying Mrs. Caruso's basic assumption—that speaking with others, not oral reading or acting or debating, is the skill most important to high school students. This belief has not always prevailed. Does our mailbag, though slender, announce a changing emphasis in the first Speech courses?

Finally, a concern for improving the student's cultural awareness through Speech and Drama appears in the correspondence before us, and the suggestions from Mr. John C. Barner of Ambridge (Pa.) High School are especially worth quoting for they have implications for courses other than the dramatics electives of which he writes. Mr. Barner, like most of his colleagues, would establish the dramatics course as one of several

electives concerned with various forms of communication, but his conception of purpose and plan for such a course seemed to us unusually interesting. "Before the dramatics course is introduced," Mr. Barner writes, "a meeting of dramatics, English, foreign language, and social studies teachers should be held to plan a three or four-year program of plays which the student body ought to see. These plays should cover the entire history of drama and include representative selections for each era."

"The dramatics course itself should treat dramatic history and stage technique; but after the first six weeks, one of the assigned plays should be produced in each six-week period. These plays would be presented for the student body but not for the general public. The result could only be an upgrading of literary and dramatic taste." Nothing in such a program should be allowed to displace dramatics from its familiar place as an extracurricular activity, Mr. Barner insists, but the wise teacher of dramatics or any other Speech activity should distinguish between the purposes and functions of curricular study and extracurricular activities serving both student body and community.

Such, then, are the views which have come to the attention of "Trends" editor. Are these the true directions of Speech education in Eastern high schools? Are they directions in which we may wisely walk? "Trends" mailbag is empty again!

#### COMMUNITY SERVICE

Several colleges and universities in the Eastern states are undertaking new projects which bring news about Speech and Drama, the fruits of classroom instruction, and Speech training itself to the general public. In several instances the availability of TV and radio time has furnished the impetus for the new efforts.

The most ambitious of such projects was reported by Judith Crist in the New York *Herald Tribune* for October 25 under the headline, "City Colleges May Set TV Education Pattern." Her story gives Speech teachers cause for pride at several points, for example: "The practical job of translating high purposes into practical—and enjoyable—television rests primarily with Giraud Chester, Assistant Professor of Speech at Queens College, currently on leave on a Ford Foundation grant for work in educational television." Under Professor Chester's leadership and with the assistance of the departments of Speech and Drama of

the municipal colleges a twenty-six week series of programs has been started "that may well set a pattern not only for what can be done by colleges but also for how it can be done through the co-operation of commercial stations, the colleges, and the community."

This new venture, carried out in collaboration with station WABD Dumont, is the outgrowth of four pilot programs presented in May and June of 1953 and here again the departments of Speech and Drama had an active and important part. One of the four programs which so pleased Dumont and college officials that they granted support to the new and extended project was an interpretation of the work of a Speech and Hearing center. On this program members of the faculty and staff of the Queens College Speech and Hearing Center explained and demonstrated diagnosis and treatment of five kinds of clinical cases.

In the new series of programs Professor Chester and his Television Co-ordinating Committee of the four colleges work with the Dumont technical staff to administer and produce the varied half-hour programs which are intended to "clarify for the American public the meaning, scope and contributions of colleges to society, the value of higher education to young men and women, the conditions of freedom necessary to higher learning, teaching and research; the range of studies encompassed by higher education, and the variety of extra and non-curricular services to students and community provided by institutions of higher education in America, as exemplified by the work of the four municipal colleges of New York City."

Across the Appalachians a different kind of opportunity for educational telecasting has affected the program of the Department of Speech at the University of Pittsburgh. Assistant Professor Robert P. Newman writes that "because of the anticipated opening of WQED, Pittsburgh's educational television station, the department is this year offering a new course in Introduction to Television and also a Television Workshop." The demands for such course offerings were made apparent during the 1953 Summer Session when Professor William S. Tacey offered a television workshop program for academic credit. The enrollment limit of fifty was over-subscribed long before the six-week workshop was scheduled to open.

At Ithaca College, Ithaca, N. Y., the college FM radio station and the Department of Speech are also laying new plans for community service.

Here, a series of discussion programs is about to begin and Dr. Gifford Wingate, Instructor in Speech, indicates that various community leaders are being invited to join selected students from discussion and public speaking classes in informal considerations of timely community problems. After some experimentation with program forms, the discussions will become a regular, weekly broadcast feature.

In a different area of community service, West Virginia University has discovered a growing demand for adult education classes in Speech. Last year the University offered evening classes in Speech for the first time in its history and found its courses in Public Speaking, Parliamentary Law, and Group Discussion Techniques enthusiastically received. This year additional courses in Persuasion, Voice and Diction, and Speech Problems of Children have been added with similar success. Professor James H. Henning, Head of the Department of Speech, comments that "Business men, industrial executives, plant managers, salesmen, secretaries, teachers, and parents seem more and more to feel the need for training in the skills of public speaking and discussion."

#### INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROJECTS

At Temple University a new curriculum, sponsored jointly by the Department of Speech and Dramatic Arts and the Department of Early Childhood and Elementary Education has been adopted. Harry L. Weinberg, Instructor in Speech, reports of this program: "This curriculum will make it possible for an undergraduate student to earn both a general teaching certificate in elementary education and the special teaching certificate which entitles the holder to serve as a Speech Correctionist in the public schools of Pennsylvania. In the past, those desiring the Speech certificate have had to earn it in a program of study beyond the four-year undergraduate curriculum. By combining requirements it is now possible for both certificates to be earned in a four-year period."

The Department of Speech at Ithaca College will this year join with the college School of Music in a special survey of hearing loss and its relation to progress in music study, according to Professor Keith Davidson of the Department of Speech. It is hoped that results of these tests will aid faculty advisers of music students as well as reveal any handicaps serious enough to require special attention.



# Significant Research In The Eastern States

—Edited by: David C. Phillips

A significant question which all of us must ponder at times is what happens to new concepts, hypotheses and facts that may be uncovered in research in Speech? Do these new findings get integrated into the thinking, writing and teaching of the members of our profession? For example, scores of theses and dissertations are written every year and find their way from the bindery onto library shelves, there to lie — often unread. Even the articles and books that are published may or may not have the effect of recasting concepts and reshaping methodologies. As a kind of test of the validity of this question which we are raising there is presented here a selective bibliography of some of the works on stage-fright which appeared in recent years. All teachers of Speech are concerned with how to aid speakers to overcome the bad effects of nervous tension on the platform. To what extent are we aided in this problem by what research workers and other observers may have discovered about the problem?

## Stage Fright — a Selected Bibliography

By Russell B. Archer

### Books, Theses, and Monographs

Ching, James. *Performance and Audience: An Investigation into the Psychological Causes of Anxiety and Nervousness in Playing, Singing, and Speaking before an Audience*. Hall, Offord. London, 1947.

Dickens, Milton, Gibson, Francis, and Prall, Caleb. "An Experimental Study of the Overt Manifestations of Stage Fright," *Speech Monographs*, XVII (March, 1950) 37-47.

Douglass, Robert L. *The Relation of Feelings of Personal Security to Effective Public Speaking*. M. A. Thesis, U. of Redlands, 1948.

Finger, Vera. *Study of a Complex Space-Time Pattern and Its Relation to Stage Fright*. M. S. Thesis, Northwestern U., 1932.

Gilkinson, Howard. "A Questionnaire Study of the Causes of Social Fears among College Speech Students," *Speech Monographs*, IX (1942) 141-160, and X (1943) 74-83.

Greenleaf, Floyd I. *An Exploratory Study of Social Speech Fright*. M. A. Thesis, State U. of Iowa, 1947.

Henning, James H. *A Study of Stage Fright through the Comparison of Students' Reactions and Instructors' Observations during Speech*

*Situations*. M. S. Thesis, Northwestern U., 1943.

Hollingworth, H. L. *The Psychology of the Audience*, American Book Co., 1935, pp. 173-226.

Johnson, Wendell, "Speech and Personality," in Bryson, Lyman, Ed., *Communication of Ideas*, pp. 53-78, Harper, 1948.

Jones, Marnetta M. *The Relationship of Certain Personality Traits to Stage Fright*. M. A. Thesis, Stanford U., 1946.

Lomas, Charles W. *A Study of Stage Fright through Students Reactions to the Speech Situation*. M. A. Thesis, Northwestern U., 1934.

Murray, Elwood. "A Study of Factors Contributing to the Mal-development of Speech Personality," *Speech Monographs*, III (1936) 95-108.

Murphy, Gardner, and Murphy Lois B. "The Individual in the Group Situation," *Experimental Social Psychology*, pp. 445-497, Harper, 1931.

Ryan, Geraldine F. *Preliminary Studies for an Experiment in the Psychodramatic Treatment of Stage Fright*. M. A. Thesis, U. of Wisconsin, 1948. (Available for loan only on microfilm).

Watkins, Dwight E. and Karr, Harrison M. *Stage Fright and What to Do About It*. Expression Co., Boston, 1940.

Wrenchly, Elma. *Study of Stage Fright Attacks in a Selected Group of Inexperienced Speakers*. M. A. Thesis, U. of Denver, 1948.

Wrenn, C. G., Ferguson, L. W., and Kennedy, J. L. "Intelligence Level and Personality," *Journal of Social Psychology*, VIII (August, 1936) 301-307.

### Periodicals

Dawson, Sidney B. "Practical Anecdotes for Stage Fright," *Etude*, 58 (Nov., 1940) 747.

Dumesnil, Maurice. "Teachers Round Table," *Etude*, 66 (Jan., 1948) 12.

Henrikson, Ernest H. "Some Effects of Stage Fright on a Course in Speech," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 29 (Dec., 1943) 490-491.

Lomas, Charles. "The Psychology of Stage Fright," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 23 (Feb., 1937) 35-44.

Lomas, Charles. "Stage Fright," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 30 (Dec., 1944) 479-485.

Maier, Guy. "Break Down in Public," *Etude*, 57 (Nov., 1939) 711.

Maier, Guy. "Stage Fright: So-Called Cure not Advisable," *Etude*, 59 (Sept., 1941) 59.

Miller, (Mrs.) Harry S. "Cure for Stage Fright," *Etude*, 60 (Nov. 1942) 738.

Robinson, A. T. "The Faith-Cure in Public Speaking," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, I (Oct., 1915) 221-228.

Romaine, Florence. "Fighting Fear with Fun," *Christian Science Monitor*, Nov. 28, 1942, p. 15.

Stewart, Duncan T. "Stage Fright Can Be Cured," *Etude*, 60 (Nov. 1942) 740.

. . . . .

Fifty letters of inquiry sent to colleges from Virginia to Maine brought in reports on research from three! Obviously this is not representative. Let us hope the other replies are in the mail — or soon will be. (Please!)

At Queens College, Clark Marlow is working on a doctoral dissertation consisting of the selection and interpretation of Indian poetry, translated into English, from the British Colonial period in India, 1858-1950. His intent is to help widen the scope of poetry available to students

and teachers of interpretation.

The Pennsylvania State University reports: (1) Robert Brubaker and Donald Bersinger are investigating, "The Effect of Frequency Distortion upon Judgments of Normal Voice Quality"; James Lennon is studying, "Pro-Union Influences in England, 1861-1863"; Clayton Schug's "A Study of Attitude toward Debate Propositions among High School and College Debaters" is scheduled for January issue of *The Speech Teacher*, and Mr. Schug is now carrying on a study of the status of Speech in American Theological Seminaries. The Penn State Library happily announces the acquisition of the complete files of *The London Times*.

From the University of Rhode Island comes word that Paul Rohe has published, "Television in the Small University," in *Player's Magazine* for October, 1953; and Warren D. Smith contributed "Stage Business — Shakespeare's Dialogue," to the October, 1953 issue of the *Shakespeare Quarterly*.

## Today's Speech Books In Review

Edited by: Arthur Eisenstadt

As the year closes, several Speech areas find themselves augmented and further developed by "the writin' fellers", as one of our professional sachems likes to term them. Television, for example, reflects this growth. *Radio and Television Communication*, by Charles F. Lindsley of Occidental College and the Pasadena Community Playhouse, albeit of earlier issue, deserves mention here. A good synthesis of the historical, political, social, technical and vocational approaches, it seems well suited for the combined radio and TV course, and can serve as both text and, in part, practice book. Regretably, television gets comparatively short treatment, and that mainly in elementary form, but as a springboard into another text for the second-semester, it makes an easy transition.

*Beginning Television Production*, by Melvin R. White, could well serve as the next training book. In compact fashion, problems in personnel, equipment, lighting, properties, costume, acting, and directing are discussed. A selected chapter bibliography facilitates amplifying each subject, if desired, and helpful diagrams and pictures supplement the text. For an advanced course

concerned mainly with technical procedures, the new *Television Broadcasting*, authored by Howard A. Chinn of CBS, furnishes intensive instruction. Much of this work deals with engineering procedures and techniques, but an understanding of this mechanical potential is valuable to those concerned with artistic and esthetic possibilities. Cameras, lighting, studio and field equipment, and sound recording are all given detailed, comprehensive examination, together with an abundance of graphic and pictorial illustration. Mr. Chinn has made a sound contribution to the field of technical television.

Speech improvement, too, has reaped a harvest which merits inspection here. Received too late for earlier review is the college-level *Basic Voice Training for Speech*, co-authored by Hahn, Lomas, Hargis, and Vandraegen. The drillwork on voice and diction is built around ear training as an essential foundation, while physiology and acoustics are included in order to make the practice material more meaningful and effective. Interesting counsel is given on the use of written and oral data for grading, and both general and loaded exercise selections are included. For the

high school teacher, it is good news indeed that the well-known *Voice and Speech Problems* has been re-issued in revised form as *Your Voice and Speech*, by Letitia Raubicheck, Director of Speech Improvement in the New York City Schools. The section on individual speech problems has now become a separate book, thus permitting more practice material in the present volume. Regional variations are now discussed in the phonetics chapter, and this reviewer is especially impressed by the lively attractiveness, contentwise, of the expanded reading selections and the treatment of conversation. A final member of this group is Ruth Becky Irwin's *Speech and Hearing Therapy*. Public-school aspects of professional procedures, speech and hearing therapy, and parent-and-teacher-education are covered in forthright, compact style. Appendices on sources of aids, the too-long overlooked Moto-Kinesthetic method, which adds no little to the professional stature of and clinic lesson plans supplement this book, one speech correction.

The dramatics vineyard shows an encouraging literary yield. In a modest-looking but highly serviceable little volume, Bert Gruver has created *The Stage Manager's Handbook*. It is fascinating and very readable precipitate of years of first-hand experience. In specific, concise language are set forth the liaison duties of the stage manager with the "playwright, director, actors, designer, house manager, stage hands, and all the members of the production staff." A Master Cue Sheet and a Working Prompt Sheet are supplied, as is an exposition of the stage manager's duties — I nearly wrote headaches — with the touring company. Actor's Equity rules and traditions neatly round off this consequential treatise. A series of university lectures by Joseph W. Krutch is now collectively offered under the title "*Modernism*" in *Modern Drama*. Shaw, Pirandello, Chekhov, Synge, O'Casey, O'Neill, Anderson, and Tennessee Williams are examined with an eye to modern ideas — although "modern" seems to be rather involuntarily defined. In any event, Mr. Krutch, in characteristically penetrating and catholic manner, offers an "...idea of what some of the radically new...ideas were", and finds that "...certain of these ideas are such that they inevitably lead, not to a bright future, but to something like intellectual and moral paralysis." No escapist he!

In some respects, a more modern dramatist than the "modernists", for many of us, is William Shakespeare. Modern or not, much of his profundity still supplies us with food for thought and

investigation. Proof of this is found in two recent publications. Both dramatics and phonetics will find themselves enriched by the Helge Kokeritz study, *Shakespeare's Pronunciation*. Somewhat brashly described as "a comprehensive study of Elizabethan English pronunciation", it is nonetheless as extensive and scholarly as any similar study in many a year. Using a combination of linguistic, historical, and phonological evidence, vowels, consonants, diphthongs and accent are analyzed, as are the linguistic circumstances of sixteenth century English. Syncopated words, a word index, phonetic transcriptions of selected sonnets and play passages, and an index of Shakespeare's rhymes are also treated, and both the lay and the pedagogical punster will revel in the study of homonymic puns. Quite different in scope and method, but no less useful for being so, is the new *Standard Book of Shakespeare Quotations*, compiled by Burton Stevenson. Almost nine thousand quotations from both the poems and plays are here arranged and indexed both by subject and within the same work, with some most interesting comparisons resulting. A very sensible concordance improves the index, and the end result is an eminently useful reference work.

In all the broad field of speech, perhaps the closest intellectual approach to absolute truth and beauty is to be found in the area of interpretative reading. Public speaking inevitably soils its hem with ugly realities, dramatics must sometimes yield to the emotional and the intuitive, and speech correction tends to the calmly scientific, but truly creative interpretation begins to approach and to be the same universals as the great literature it kindles. These thoughts are motivated by a perusal of Lowrey and Johnson's *Interpretative Reading*, and the realization that this art form, under the impetus of readers like Charles Laughton, Emlyn Williams, Edith Evans and Basil Rathbone, is experiencing a rebirth of popular appeal. Techniques of interpretation, including discussion of thinking, timing, vocal and bodily action, backgrounds, and choral reading, furnish excellent training in theory. The second half of the book, "Selections for Interpretation," furnishes equally excellent opportunity for training in application. For a lofty yet practicable approach — a difficult twosome at times — the authors deserve warm commendation.

Here, then, are the end-of-year offerings. None is perfect, none pretends to offer the last definitive work in the field, yet all seem to be honest labors honestly presented. Like Stevenson's lamplighters,



each in its own way helps to dispel the dark, to proffer a helping hand, to light the way as best it can. As such, the readers can deservedly say of them, "It's been a good year."

#### Books Reviewed

- Lindsley, Charles F., *Radio and Television Communication*, N. Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1952, 492 pp. \$5.50.
- White, Melvin R., *Beginning Television Production*, Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co., 1953, 107 pp. \$2.50.
- Chinn, Howard, *Television Broadcasting*, N. Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1953, 700 pp. \$10.00
- Hahn, Elsie, et. al., *Basic Voice Training for Speech*, N. Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 253 pp. \$4.25.
- Raubichek, Letitia, *Your Voice and Speech*, N. Y.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953, 376 pp. \$4.05.
- Irwin, Ruth S., *Speech and Hearing Therapy*, N. Y.: Harper and Brothers, 1953, 202 pp. \$2.50.
- Gruver, Bert, *The Stage Manager's Handbook*, N. Y.: Harper and Brothers, 1953, 202 pp. \$2.50.
- Krutch, Joseph Wood, "Modernism" in *Modern Drama*, Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1953, 138 pp. \$2.75.
- Kokeritz, Helge, *Shakespeare's Pronunciation*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953, 516 pp. \$7.50.
- Stevenson, Burton, *The Standard Book of Shakespeare Quotations*, N. Y.: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1953, 766 pp. \$7.50.
- Lowrey, Sara and Johnson, Gertrude E., *Interpretative Reading*, N. Y.: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1953, 595 pp. \$3.75.

• • • • •

#### Audio-Visual Sources

The following data has been compiled for the convenience of the teacher in school, industry, armed forces, social organization or private group. The audi-visual aids listed vary from "free" to "commercial rental", from charts to color sound film. They are useful in maintaining interest, encouraging group participation, clarifying complex or unfamiliar subject-matter, and in alleviating a host of similar educational problems. In this issue, general source-centers are given, each a compilation source in itself. Our next issue will list free and inexpensive visual helps and other teaching aids on special subjects.

1. Aetna Educational Films, Public Education Department, Aetna Life Co., Hartford, Conn. (free loan)
2. *Business-Sponsored Educational Materials*, N. Y.: 420 Lexington Ave., N. Y. C. (88 pp., \$1.50).
3. Coronet Films, *Coronet Magazine*, 65E. South Water St., Chicago, Ill. (catalog of 487 available 16mm. films for rental).
4. George Peabody College for Teachers, Division of Surveys, *Free and Inexpensive Learning Materials*, Nashville, Tenn. (194 p. catalog, compiled in 1952. \$1.00).
5. National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Education Association. *Catalog of Free and Inexpensive Teaching Aids for High Schools* (104 p. catalog, compiled in 1948. \$1.00).
6. Miller, Bruce, *Sources of Free and Inexpensive Teaching Aids*, Ontario, Calif. (38p. catalog, 1951

edition, \$.50).

7. Modern Talking Picture Service, Inc., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N. Y. (Free loan of 16mm. sound and color films).
8. McGraw-Hill Text Films, 330 W. 42 St., N. Y. 36, N. Y. (Free catalog of educational films and film strips for 1953, 20 pp.).
9. U. S. Gov't. Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., *A Directory of 2002 16mm. Film Libraries* (1951 catalog No. FS5.3:951/11, 113 pp. \$.35).
10. U. S. Library of Congress, *Guide to U. S. Gov't. Motion Pictures*, Supt. of Documents, Washington 25, D. C. (catalog, \$.40).
11. U. S. Steel, Publication Education Division, Bethlehem, Pa. 16mm. films available for free loan, 1953, 16p. catalog).
12. Educator's Progress Service, Randolph, Wisconsin, *Educator's Guide to Free Films* (Handbook, 110 pp., \$.50.00).

Other very helpful sources are: Educational Department, DeVry Corp., 1111 Armitage Ave., Chicago 14, Ill., which publishes and distributes gratis a periodical called *Movie News*; the magazine *Audio-Visual Guide*, at 1630 Springfield Ave., Maplewood, N. J., and the NEA Research Division of National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth St., N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

• • • • •

*This department is pleased to present the following guest article on public speaking texts. The writer is William R. Demougeot of Princeton University, the subject an outgrowth of his own specialized teaching activity.*

Leaving to others the description and criticism of individual textbooks, the writer of this paper has taken the position of the man trying to see the forest rather than the trees by noting the elements common to a group of eight recent textbooks. These books were chosen as representative of those used in basic speech courses which have "standard" approaches to public speaking; that is, the semantic, personality, sociometric and similar schools of thought are not represented in this list:

- Baird, A. C. and Knower, F. H. *General Speech*, 1949, N. Y.: McGraw-Hill, 500 pp.
- Brigance, W. N. *Speech*, 1952, N. Y.: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 582 pp.
- Bryant, D. C., and Wallace K. R. *Fundamentals of Public Speaking*, 2nd ed., 1953, N. Y.: Appleton-Century Crofts, 493 pp.
- Gilman, W. E., Aly B. and Reid, L. D., *Fundamentals of Speaking*, 1951, N. Y.: MacMillan, 656 pp.
- Gray, G. W., and Braden, W. W. *Public Speaking*, 1951, N. Y.: Harper and Brothers, 581 pp.
- McBurney, J. H., and Wrage, E. J. *The Art of Good Speech*, 1953, N. Y.: Prentice Hall, 581 pp.
- Soper, Paul. *Basic Public Speaking*, 1949, N. Y.: Oxford University Press, 394 pp.
- Williamson, A. B., Fritz, C. A., and Ross H. R. *Speaking in Public*, 2nd ed., 1948, N. Y.: Prentice-Hall, 400 pp.

The most striking common elements were those that denoted trends in the writing of public speak-

ing textbooks. To one who concludes a thesis on the textbooks of 1900-1930 by stating that they slighted the rational and ethical aspects of speech in their concentration on audience adaptation, the most impressive trend is the obvious effort to revive the respectability of public speaking. Sensitive to the bad name given rhetoric by the demagogues who have successfully perverted it to win and hold public support, these writers have attempted to persuade students that public speaking has dignity and integrity as well as utility. In five books, this takes the form of citing its tradition, its use by prominent people for good ends, etc. In all books there is considerable stress on the obligations of the speaker; in McBurney & Wrage and in Brigrance this takes the form of whole chapters on *ethos*, and in two others *ethos* is extensively discussed under other headings.

Part of this effort to dignify speech is the increasing use of psychological, sociological, and speech research to substantiate assertions. While this research seldom alters accepted theories, it adds to the prestige of public speaking because it satisfies the modern students' respect for the scientific.

Further evidence of an increased attention to the rational and ethical is the fact that six of the books have entire chapters or major portions thereof devoted to evidence and reasoning, and all the books modify the earlier stress on audience adaptation by impressing on the reader the importance of a sound rational base on which to build a speech, as well as the obligations of a speaker in a democratic society.

Audience adaptation is not, however, slighted. In fact, analysis is given more attention, including occasional references to culture patterns and other sociological approaches to understanding people. It is worth noting that most textbooks cover audience analysis as a unit and few do an adequate job of helping the student to use his analysis in the planning of his speech.

Delivery is increasingly subordinated. In seven of the eight books, only introductory remarks on delivery are found in the first half of the book. While all have chapters on voice, articulation, etc., Winans' "sense of communication" is accepted by all as the key to effective delivery, which accounts for the relative subordination of the "technical" factors in delivery.

Another noteworthy trend is the frequent inclusion of chapters on group discussion. In earlier

textbooks, this was not the case, although Dewey's reflective thought process was occasionally cited as an aid to analysis and, even less frequently, as a method of organizing a speech. McBurney & Wrage mention inquiry as one of the four types of speaking, and closer examination reveals that they include group discussion in this category. All this attention to group discussion in basic public speaking textbooks may presage a new type of speech. It also serves to make these books more useful in adult courses, where there is usually some eagerness to learn about group discussion and conference methods.

Also useful in adult education is the increasing attention to visual aids and to radio and television speaking. Two books (Bryant & Wallace and Gray & Braden) devote entire chapters to visual aids, and all books treat this topic at some length.

Six books have chapters on radio and television speaking. These types of information are, at least in the experience of this writer, much in demand in industrial and evening courses.

Half the books cited here have chapters on listening. While some may feel that this is an unjustified enlargement of the area proper to instruction in public speaking, there is little doubt that such material serves to create more critical audiences and thus tends to elevate the calibre of all speeches. In a democratic society, attentive and intelligent listening is just as important to effective communication as many speech principles.

Many teachers will be happy to know that there is a tendency to give brief "previews" of the preparation of a speech by including early chapters on "first principles". Five books have such sections, which should be good news to those who have tried to reconcile the desirability of getting students on their feet early with the impossibility of having them read enough before then to produce a satisfactory speech.

In summary then, the notable trends in the writing of textbooks for standard basic courses in public speaking are: more attention to the dignity of public speaking, the obligations of a speaker, and the scientific foundation of speech theory; increased stress on argumentation; using sociological approaches to audience analysis; more subordination of delivery; inclusion of group discussion and listening as proper studies of a prospective speaker; more attention to visual aids and radio-television speaking; and more help in preparing first speeches.

## OUR AUTHORS

For this issue we bring you another group of Speech experts who write of problems different from those featured in the first two issues. The field of Speech is far too broad to be represented in all its facets in any one issue, but as we proceed we trust that time will bring to our board a varied diet that, if not strictly pleasing to all tastes, may yet satisfy all professional nutritional requirements. (Query: any other offerings for our "mixed metaphors" collection!)

Joseph F. O'Brien, Professor of Speech at The Pennsylvania State University, demonstrates in his spirited article on parliamentary procedure both the knowledge which underlies his *Parliamentary Law for the Layman* (Harpers, 1952) and the humane view that animates his broad responsibilities in the Department he has served for a quarter of a century.

Earl E. Fleischman (Ph. D., U. of Michigan) combines interest in the Speech Arts and the philosophy of Education in his position as Assistant Professor of Speech in the City College of New York—and also in his thoughtful article on personality growth in the classroom.

The point expressed by Ralph N. Schmidt (Ph. D., Syracuse University), Chairman of the Department of Speech at Utica College and former Executive Secretary of the SAES, seems well worth reprinting from the *Phi Delta Kappan*, where it appeared in the Feb., 1953, issue.

Walter Duncan, who went from the staff of Temple University to the sales staff of NBC in

New York, and to part-time teaching with the School of Business of the City College of New York, reminds us again that segmentalizing the field of communication violates its unity and thus may handicap the learning process.

Robert Haakenson (Ph. D., State U. of Iowa), who is Assistant Professor of Speech at Temple, Executive Secretary of the Pennsylvania State Speech Association, and Editor of the SAES Newsletter, presents a sparking continuation of the survey of radio-television developments which he commenced in our first issue. Dr. Haakenson writes from his experience in conducting a 15-week series of half-hour programs, "You Are the Next Speaker!" on WFIL-TV's *University of the Air*, in Philadelphia.

Ghost-Writing appeals to Walter J. Stelkovic, who followed his M. A. at Denver with further graduate study at Penn State, as worthy of more detailed consideration than it has received from the Speech profession.

Frank Westley Merritt (Ph. D., Cornell), Associate Professor and Director of the Speech Division at Bucknell, draws upon his minor in Speech Correction for some trenchant observations on delayed speech.

A case study in methods of treating a child handicapped by subnormal hearing is presented by Harriet M. Dunn, Speech Therapist for the Vermont Ass'n. for the Crippled, Inc., and Christine L. McCloskey, who worked on the case under Miss Dunn's direction.

## CONVENTION NEWS

Dr. Gordon F. Hostettler, Executive Secretary of the SAES, calls attention to the fact that the Hotel in Philadelphia where our Spring Convention is to be held has changed its name from the Penn Sheraton to the Penn Sherwood. Please note this change in sending in your reservations for the Convention days, April 8-9-10, 1954. Dave Phillips, our Vice-President, who is in charge of the program, promises a sprightly series of sessions of interest and value to all who speak and teach Speech. We are looking for the largest as well as the best Convention ever!



## Random Comments on Speakers

John Fiske believes that the following brief and little-known speech by George Washington may have changed the course of history, by persuading the delegates at the Constitutional Convention to stop quarrelling and agree on the text of the United States Constitution: "It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair; the event is in the hand of God." From *The Critical Period of American History* -1783-1789, p. 232.

Horace Greeley said of Jefferson Davis, on the eve of the Civil War: "Every Northern Senator will admit that from the Southern side of the floor the most formidable adversary to meet in debate is the thin, pale, polished, intellectual-looking Mississippian with the unimpassioned demeanor, the habitual courtesy and the occasional unintentional arrogance which reveals his consciousness of great commanding power." *New York Tribune*, August 8, 1859.

James Fenimore Cooper, on Samuel Taylor

Coleridge as a conversationalist: "Coleridge reminded me of a barrel to which every other man's tongue acted as a spigot; for no sooner did the latter move than it set his own contents in a flow." From *England*, Vol. I, Letter XI.

Lyman Abbott wrote of Phillips Brooks: "His body was a fit tabernacle for a large mind. . . . I have known greater orators than Phillips Brooks. Ward Beecher had more stops in his organ; Daniel Webster was more massive, his sentences were more heavily weighted; Abraham Lincoln was more persuasive. . . . But no orator I ever heard was more inspirational." *Outlook*, Vol. 128, May 18, 1921.

When John Quincy Adams was appointed to the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric at Harvard, he commenced his lectures with this entry in his *Diary*: "I enter this day upon my fortieth year. And I this day commenced my course of lectures on rhetoric and oratory — an undertaking of magnitude and importance, for the proper accomplishment of which I pray for patience and perseverance, and the favor from above, without which no human industry can avail. . . ." July 11, 1807.

For SPEECH TRAINING—  
and Oral Communications

### How To Become A Successful Speaker

BY HAROLD P. ZELKO

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

A concise, practical, but comprehensive text—for adult level students and others interested in practical speech improvement.

176 pp                      Illustrated                      \$3.00

—and for the Instructor:

INSTRUCTOR'S GUIDE FOR DEVELOPING  
SUCCESSFUL SPEAKERS                      \$6.00

—with an additional Training Aid:

EFFECTIVE SPEECH TRAINING  
NOTEBOOK                      \$ .50

HOW TO HOLD MEETINGS' AND  
CONFERENCES (booklet)                      \$ .25

by the same author

**National Foreman's Institute, Inc.**

NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT

— ★ —

### Today's Speech

COMPOSED

AND

PRINTED

BY

**The Himes Printing Company, Inc.**

326 WEST BEAVER AVENUE

STATE COLLEGE, PENNSYLVANIA

TELEPHONE: 2110

— ★ —

---

THE DIVISION OF SPEECH

in the

Department of English

Lehigh University

OFFERS COURSES IN

- ★ Speech Fundamentals
- ★ Business and Professional Speech
- ★ Debate
- ★ Radio
- ★ Dramatics
- ★ Parliamentary Law
- ★ Discussion

*Students in the College of Arts and Sciences,  
College of Engineering and the College  
or Business are eligible to  
enroll.*

FOR INFORMATION WRITE TO

Prof. H. Barrett Davis  
Head of the Division of Speech  
Lehigh University  
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

---

---

YOU CAN  
TALK WELL

by  
RICHARD C. REAGER

A practical guide to effectiveness in speaking.  
Comprehensive, clear, based on a lifetime of  
experience in university classrooms, extension  
classes and industrial training groups.

Covers such important subjects as

*How to develop your native abilities*

*Radio Speech*

*Telephone Talk*

*The Presiding Officer*

*Platform lecturer*

*Sales efficiency*

*The interview*

*Banquet speaker*

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY PRESS  
New Brunswick, N. J.

---